

JULY MEINVIELLE

DE LAMENNAIS

A

MARITAIN

... The general lines [in Maritain's work] come from L'Avenir and have a Thomistic root, and we see renewed in it the attempt at a philosophical and Christian interpretation of the modern world, the breadth of which equals, in terms of doctrinal actuality, that of L'Avenir (J. V. Ducatillon, O.P., Dios y la libertad, Orden Cristiano, Buenos Aires, 1945, p. 219).

I would rather fear now to have become too conciliatory (Maritain's words, reproduced in Revue Thomiste, no. I, II of t. 48, Paris, 1948).

We are moved to publish for the second time this book, which achieved some resonance in its time, not so much to renew the polemic with the illustrious author of "Integral Humanism", but to make present the position that we defended in that book and that today is more current and valid than then. In fact, while the thesis of a Christian animation of modern civilization, defended by Maritain, has been later shared by distinguished theologians such as Journet¹, Chenu², Congar³, H. Urs Von Balthasar⁴ and others, and has penetrated in the

¹ *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné*, Desclée de Brouwer, Paris.

² *Vie intellectuelle*, Février, 1954.

³ Ibid. and *Vraie et Fausse Reforme dans l'Eglise*.

In the current Catholic mentality, nourishing the dangerous line of Christian progressivism, the process of dissolution of that same civilization has continued until it threatens it with total self-destruction. If the modern world, which in a certain sense has Catholic roots, is to be saved - we say instead - it must be saved by the traditional *Catholic City*, by that of which St. Pius X said "it is not to be invented or built in the clouds but has existed and exists, it is Christian civilization, it is the Catholic city". This is our firm conviction. The traditional and sacred Catholic city of the same type, in its essence, as the one known in the Middle Ages, can only save us from a world that is dying because of its secularism and atheism.

Behind this discussion between the Catholic City and the New Christianity, a deeper one develops on the "progressive" character of history. For Lamennais as well as for Maritain and for those who share his ideas, history develops in a rhythm that, although it can be momentarily uneven and regressive, in the end, is necessarily progressive. In "Raison et Raisons"⁵ replying to Garrigou Lagrange, Maritain writes: "He [Meinvielle] attributes to me with holy horror the thesis that '*historical development is necessarily progressive*'. And he adds: 'I have already made in *Théonas* a critique of the idea of necessary progress which I now find too brutal, but of which I maintain the essentials. And at the same time that I restore all that is true in the notion of human progress (a notion whose origin is Christian), I sustain the thesis that, in fact, history goes at the same time, by two simultaneous contrary movements, one of ascension, the other of fall, towards the increase of evil and towards that of good". In other places Maritain has to call this law of the ambivalence of history.

But Maritain must agree that if we want to avoid Manichaeism, ambivalence demands that we must ultimately resolve for unity. In short, we must accept the progress or the return of man for a certain historical period.

There may be in man -a heterogeneous being of many dimensions- partial aspects of simultaneous progress and return. But *man insofar as*

⁴ The article "Raser les bastions," in *Dieu vivant*, no. 25.

⁵ *Egloff*, Paris, 1947, p. 273.

man, humanity as humanity, and human history as human history, will progress or regress. It will progress, we add, if it draws closer to God, and it will regress if it moves away from God. And it is known that for certain human groups it is easy to assess in certain periods this approach or departure. Maritain, on the other hand, seems to admit only progress. In *The Rights of Man*⁶ he categorically affirms that progress must be accepted if one does not want to despair of man and freedom, which is in itself a principle of historical suicide. And so that there is no doubt about it, he invokes the scientific authority of a typically progressive author, that of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, and there he says textually: "I have had the pleasure of finding from the point of view of its author, similar conceptions in a lecture recently delivered in Peking by the famous paleontologist Teilhard de Chardin⁷ ; in it he indicates that however old prehistory may seem to make it to our eyes, humanity is still *very young*, and shows that the evolution of humanity must be approached as the continuation of the evolution of the whole of life, where *progress* means *ascension of consciousness* and where *the ascension of consciousness* is linked with a higher degree of *organization*; "if progress is to continue it will not do so on its own: Evolution by the *mechanism of its synthesis*, becomes more and more charged with freedom" ."

And in order to understand the scope that in his conception has the idea of terrestrial progress of Humanity, Maritain closes the chapter with the following unusual statement that constitutes a kind of dogma of progressivism: "One can still point out, he says, with the same wise man, that whatever their belief or lack of religious beliefs, men who admit or deny the forward march of humanity, take, in this way, position of what is practically decisive from the point of view of the life of human societies". It is no longer God or the approach to God that is decisive for man in his earthly life. And so Maritain adds: "With respect to the Kingdom of God and eternal life, the acceptance or the rejection of religious dogma points out the essential difference between spirits. With respect to the temporal life and the earthly city, the acceptance or rejection of the historical vocation of humanity".

⁶ Editorial Daedalus, p. 57 ff.

⁷ *Réflexion sur le progrès*, Peking, 1941.

It is clear that if one accepts this thesis of the necessarily progressive character of history, one must agree that the modern world with naturalism, liberalism and communism, which come after the medieval Catholic city, would be more human than the latter; and that therefore, the new Catholic city - Maritain's New Christianity, the lay one - must not renounce that naturalism, liberalism and communism of the anti-Christian revolution. The conclusion could not be more impious. However, it flows in good logic from the principles.

The philosophy of Christian history that underlies the background of Maritain's positions must then determine a dangerous stance in the face of the living problems of modern life. In fact, all the movements that have been shaking the disturbing rhythm of contemporary Catholicism, at the European and even at the universal level, are prophetically consigned in Maritain's "New Christianity". This can mean a note of praise or censure for the illustrious thinker. This will depend on the final evaluation to be made of this Catholicism.

There is no doubt that a noble impulse is hidden in the vitality of contemporary Catholicism in its attempt to make contact with the people of today. Dialogue", taken to all manifestations of life, is but the translation of this desire to communicate the Christian Message with the deepest needs of today's man. And this man, whether he likes it or not, is shaped by five centuries of modern history, which, although it contains valuable acquisitions in the field of the sciences of verification and in the application of these same sciences to human utility - what in common parlance is called Science and Technology - is also driven by a desire for pure independence. Man today, in short, does not want to depend on anything or anyone. He wants to be self-sufficient. He wants to be omnisufficient. But this is precisely what the *Revolution* is all about. Revolution that is called Liberty, Equality, Fraternity. Revolution of the Man who does not want to recognize his character of *creature* and who does not want to recognize his character of *fallen* creature.

If man's condition is that of a creature and a fallen creature, man's health consists *first of all* in accepting his dependence on the Creator and his dependence on the Redeemer. God and Christ are then the great values of Man. And since God and Christ do not come to us except through the

mediation of the

Church, the Church as the Visible Society of Salvation, is the Ark of Health for the whole man. For the private man as well as for the public man.

The health of private and public man consists first of all in the humble acceptance of the Church. We say the health of man. Not only eternal health but also temporal health. Man cannot have what little happiness he has in the present world by *other* principles than those which assure him of happiness in eternal life. These principles alone can make him *habitable* in this vale of tears. They will by no means convert the earth into a paradise, but they will prevent it from becoming a hell.

We say further that the health of man consists *first of all in the* humble acceptance of the Church. We do not say *only*. We accept and even demand that man take care of his progress and his temporal welfare. And in this *the* Church has nothing *directly* to do. It is man, in his civilizing movement, who must concern himself with his earthly welfare. But if he does not want this concern, far from being beneficial, to be detrimental to him, he must undertake it in dependence and subordination to that other concern by which he must seek *first of all* his eternal health, which is procured for him by the Church.

What we say about man applies to man in all his manifestations. Man cannot be happy or know peace in the private sphere if he does not know it in the public sphere; he cannot know it, especially today, in the national sphere if he does not know it in the international sphere. For this reason, the presence of the Church, as the necessary and primary cause of health, must be felt in private and public life, in the institutions of national and world life.

Well, what about the very new Catholicism that the promoters of Christian Progressivism want to inculcate in us? Whether out of shame *-non erubescio evangelium*, Rom. 1, 16-, or out of conformity to the world *-nolite conformari huic saeculo*, Rom. 12, 2-, they dare not proclaim or put into practice such clear and traditional principles of the truth of salvation for the people. They dare not denounce as deleterious the *revolutionary* principle from which modern man suffers, in his modern condition; they dare not proclaim the necessity of subordination of the temporal to the eternal, of civilization and of the

values of culture to the Church. And then they want to reconcile the Revolution and the Church, the modern world and Christ, communism and Christianity.

But this reconciliation of the Revolution with the Church of the current Christian Progressivism is but a repetition of the impossible attempt formulated by Lamennais in *L'Avenir* and by Maritain in his *Integral Humanism*, and which, in one way or another, is also adopted by the theologians who are promoting the current currents of Pastoral Theology. But let us leave the latter for another study⁸. Suffice it to point out the timeliness of this book, written twenty years ago, to diagnose the evils of the current Christian Progressivism and to forecast the fate of contemporary society.

Incredible as it may seem to think it, Christian Progressivism, whether by involuntary or deliberate error, conceives the relations of the Church and the World, of Humanity and Christ in such a way that, far from healing the World by raising it upwards, towards the Church, it intends to use the Church for the construction of the new City of Man. Hence all the efforts of Christian progressives are directed to unite with socialists and communists in the *common* task of a City of Fraternity and universal Peace. This is the City of the Revolution which, in the eighteenth century was naturalistic, in the nineteenth century liberal and today is under the sign of socialism.

A perverse attempt insofar as it seeks the health of man in man himself. A perverse attempt inasmuch as they use Christ and the Church as one of the many currents that must collaborate with the others in *the* health of man. A perverse attempt inasmuch as it will end in the ruin of Man.

Therefore, in the Pastoral Theology of Christian Progressivism, one does not work to raise man and elevate him in the Church, and through the Church, in Christ and in God, but one uses the Church, and through it Christ and God, for Man, for the building of the City of Man. If not always knowingly, Christ is used for the edification of the city of Antichrist. Hence all the eagerness, conscious or unconscious, of Christian Progressivism in

⁸ See: *The Church and the Modern World*. Christian Progressivism in Congar and other recent

theologians. Ediciones Teoría. Buenos Aires, 1966.

transform the Church into the World and the World into the Church⁹ . But these are topics to be clarified in a special book. Themes, however, already treated and included in Maritain's *Integral Humanism*. Hence the timeliness of this second edition of our *From Lamennais to Maritain*.

We have added to this second edition a new chapter in which we comment on Maritain's book against Progressivism -*Le Paysan de la Garonne*-, which has raised so many polemics in our days. We have also inserted our study on *The Conciliar Declaration on Religious Freedom and Traditional Doctrine*.

JULY MEINVIELLE

Feast of the Assumption of the Virgin, 1967.

⁹ See the article by Schillebeeckx, "Church and Humanity," *Concilium*, 1, January 1965, and "Eglise et monde," by Ives Congar in *Esprit*, February 1965.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

The present volume contains six studies and a conclusion, where some aspects of Jacques Maritain's social-political philosophy are examined in the light of Catholic principles. We say expressly of the social-political philosophy, because if Maritain, who presents his positions as perfectly compatible with the Catholic faith, would limit himself to analyze the facts and orientations of modern life without setting them up as a norm of conduct, theology would have little or nothing to intervene in his disquisitions. But Maritain elaborates a *new* social-political philosophy; a *new* norm that must regulate the public action of Catholics throughout the world, if they do not want to disappoint the hopes that the "New Christianity" has placed in them, the new norm of universal human coexistence that must move them and guide them as an "objective apt to be fully and integrally *desired*, and to drag effectively towards itself, to finalize effectively the human energies that will tend towards it in a way all the more lively when the will will will propose it in its integrity"¹⁰ .

Since the judgment that emerges from the present book could appear severe to the reader who does not keep in mind the *immutability* of the Rule of Conduct that the doctrine of the Church entails, it should not be idle to warn that the vulnerable point of every novelty that wants to be introduced in the Church lies precisely in its *novelty*. The Church is a life; a life of the intelligence and a life of the will. Life whose only source is the bosom of the Deity. The Church lives from what she has received. From what she has received from God, through Jesus Christ, her divine Founder, through the Apostles. And the Church has received, in deposit, a single Doctrine, which cannot receive *new contributions* after the death of the last Apostle. The sacred and inviolable watchword of the Church is to preserve faithfully the deposit entrusted to her. The Apostle's pressing advice to his disciple Timothy is famous: "*O Timothy, guard the deposit of faith which I have entrusted to you, avoiding profane novelties in speech*"¹¹ . "*The things you have heard from me in the presence of many witnesses, entrust to faithful men who will be able to teach them also to others*"¹² . And the words of the Apostle to the Galatians, when he says to them: "*I marvel how so lightly*

¹⁰ *Du régime temporel et de la liberté*, Desclée de Brouwer, 1933, p. 131.

¹¹ I, Tim. VI, 20.

¹² II, Tim. II, 2.

You forsake him who called you into the grace of Jesus Christ to follow another gospel, but it is not that there is another gospel, but that there are some who trouble you and want to upset the gospel of Christ. But even if we ourselves, or an angel from heaven, if possible, should preach to you a gospel other than that which we have preached, let him be accursed. I have told you and I tell you again, whoever preaches to you a gospel different from the one you have received, let him be accursed"¹³ . It is therefore sacred and inviolable to guard the deposit of divine truth without the slightest alteration. But this divine Truth is not simply to be *believed*, but to be *practiced*.

And what does this have to do with Maritain, the reader will ask. Very much so, because here lies the whole problem of Maritain's "New Christianity". Maritain proposes in his new Christianity a *practical norm of Catholic social action* that is *other*, essentially different, from that practiced in the Church. Directly and primarily he does not propose something different to be *believed*, but something different to be *practiced*. But this something different to be *practiced* has to suppose a conception of life, also different to be professed. For *velis nolis* man's action flows from what he thinks. Therefore, if it is *something different*, if it is *something else*, it introduces a novelty in the Sacred Deposit of Catholic Truth. And here appears the gravity of Maritain's attempt. For as theologians teach, *false* doctrine in the style of Scripture is called *another* doctrine; this is why in the text of St. Paul to the Galatians, quoted above, it speaks of *another* Gospel and St. Paul says to Timothy: "You know well how, when I went to Macedonia, I asked you to stay in Ephesus, so that you might make certain people understand that they would not teach *another* doctrine", "*ne aliter docerent*"¹⁴ .

And so Maritain, in introducing *another* Catholic Rule of Social Conduct, because of the necessary connections that the speculative has with the practical, and the social with the individual, has to propose *another* Gospel than that of Jesus Christ.

The present study, which covers only some of the more outward aspects of the deviations which, in our opinion, Maritain's New Christianity contains, is

¹³ Gal. I, 6-9.

¹⁴ I, Tim. I, 3.

preliminary to other studies in which we will try to investigate the deepest roots of the deviations of his philosophy¹⁵ .

In the meantime, we wish to underline that the fulminating fame that the Maritainist theses have obtained in the world, bring to mind those words of St. Augustine: "*Mira sunt quae dicitis, nova sunt quae dicitis, falsa sunt quae dicitis*"¹⁶ .

It is admirable that the forces of revolution universally applaud the program of the New Christianity. *New* that by the path of Revolution, Catholics can establish the social sovereignty of Jesus Christ. Let us see then what *falsehood* this New Christianity contains.

¹⁵ We undertook this study in part with our book *Critique of Maritain's conception of the human person*.

¹⁶ *Admirable what you say, new what you say, false what you say* (Contra Julianum, III, 3).

FROM THE MYTH OF PROGRESS TO THE NEW CHRISTIANITY

Nihil novum sub sole.
(Eccles. I, 10).

Maritain states in his *Les Droits* an exceptionally important alternative. "It can be pointed out, he says, that whatever their belief or lack of religious belief, men who admit and those who deny the forward march of Humanity, take, in this way, a position on what is practically decisive from the point of view of the life of human societies"¹⁷. And indeed: if it is established as a Postulate that *Humanity marches forward*, then all historical events must be interpreted as necessarily good, which in no way must be opposed, but rather stimulated, accelerating the fortunate end that must crown its ever constant perfection.

If, on the contrary, this Postulate is not accepted, it will not necessarily be admitted as the First Law that Humanity necessarily regresses; the progress or return of a society will be measured by its conformity or non-conformity with the objective law of values which, in the last analysis, is nothing other than the antecedent will of God who has fixed to each thing the perfection proper to its being.

The alternative pointed out by Maritain is valid as to the first term; that is, the very fact of establishing as a Postulate, *the forward march of Humanity*, entails a conception of life based on the occurrence of the historical dialectic; and since the historical dialectic of Modernity is the Revolution, to oppose the Revolution is bad, to work in its favor is good.

¹⁷ *Les Droits de l'homme et la loi naturelle*, p. 48, Éditions de la Maison Française, New York, 1943; Spanish edition, p. 58, Editorial Dédalo, Buenos Aires, 1961.

All revolutionaries, from the days of Giordano Bruno, through the ideologues of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries with Volney and Condorcet at their head, to the dreamers of the most advanced communism, have wanted to hallucinate themselves and others with the idea of a hypostatized *Humanity* that is moving uncontrollably in an ever progressive historical process, as described by Buchez in his *Esquisse de la Philosophie*. Does this idea respond to anything real? Maritain, the Maritain of yesteryear in his *Théonas*, makes the profound observation that "the very idea of necessary and universal progress is not an idea properly so called... which supplies the intelligence with a grasp of reality and therefore measurable and rectifiable, but on the contrary one of these verbal formulas which are all the more perfect in their kind the more independent and distant they are from things and impose themselves on them more arbitrarily.... idea-myth, which, emptied of all intellectual content, and destined only to provoke certain resonances in the imagination and in the appetite, dominates despotically the entire field of representation, of the individual himself, whom it makes vibrate as soon as it is uttered... ideological divinities, pseudo-ideas devouring the real, whose whole constitutes modern mythology, and in whose first row shines the idea of Progress"¹⁸.

In Lamennais and Maritain, after *Réligion et Culture*, this devouring idea of the real bit hard, disturbing their whole being. In a parallel, the accuracy of which the reader will have to judge, we shall present the content of this pseudo-idea which, just as in Condorcet and Volney, acquires a rationalist-materialist coating, and in Comte, a sociological-positivist one, and in a Darwin, evolutionist-materialist, and in Saint-Simon, Buchez and Enfantin, it is tinged with a Christian-humanitarianism, in Lamennais and Maritain it acquires *Catholic* contours, with a romantic emphasis in the former, serious, philosophical and Thomistic in the latter.

In Lamennais¹⁹ it will be extremely easy for us to follow the course of this pseudo-idea because, under his pressure, the famous article on *The Future of Society* was written.²⁰

¹⁸ *Théonas*, deux. édit., Nouvelle Librairie Nationale, 1925, p. 120.

¹⁹ Happiness Robert, called de La Mennais and who, from 1827, signed simply Lamennais, was born in Saint-Malo, on June 19, 1782. Orphaned at the age of 5, he educated himself. At the age of 10 he had read Rousseau. Under pressure from his brother Jean, he entered the seminary and

was ordained on March 9, 1816. In his life we must distinguish a *Catholic period* (1816-1834) and a *non-Catholic period* (1834-1854). He first wrote his well-known work *Essay on indifference in*

The progress of mankind

"If laws," he says there, "emanating from an infinite wisdom which presides over the physical world, direct and regulate its movements, and, in spite of the sometimes apparent disorder of phenomena, lead it to its ends with an irresistible force and an immutable regularity, it is not to be thought that the moral world, abandoned by providence, floats at random upon the dark, immense, blurred sea of ages, and has not likewise laws, which, without altering the nature of free persons, lead it also, following its course, abandoned by providence, floats at random on the dark, immense, stormy sea of the ages and does not also have laws which, without altering the nature of free persons, also lead it, following an order of harmonious and regular development, to particular ends and to the general end of creation. These laws of which history constitutes the clearest and most precise expression as the centuries go by, manifest themselves principally in the great epochs in which one period of society ends and another begins, because then, stripped of the old envelope of a past forever extinguished, everything is reborn, everything changes, everything is transformed, and the breezes of the future, bringing to the peoples like perfumes of a new land, rush impatiently across the seas towards the unknown end of their longings"²¹ .

Lamennais, a Catholic philosopher who has fallen in love with the myth of Progress, *catholizes* it, that is, seeks to justify it, on the basis of the providential government of God who directs all things to the ends proposed by his divine Wisdom.

The work on religion, which brought him "in a single day the power of Bossuet", in Lacordaire's phrase. Although infected by the error of traditionalism, whose great representative was Bonald, in this work Lamennais defends the Catholic thesis of the subordination of the State to the Church. It is considered as typically ultramontane. In 1929, he wrote *The Progress of the Revolution and the War against the Church*, which already indicated Lamennais' liberal position that would be clearly affirmed in the newspaper *l'Avenir* (16 Oct. 1830 - 15 Nov. 1831) where he was surrounded by Lacordaire and Montalembert, among others, as collaborators. Condemned by Gregory XVI in the *Mirari Vos*, he apparently submitted, but when he published *Words of a Believer*, a demagogic and impious pamphlet, he was expressly condemned by the *Singulari Nos* of July 7, 1834. From then on he gave himself up to socialism and was elected deputy in 1848. He died on March 1, 1854, giving outward signs of

impenitence and, in compliance with his will, his corpse was thrown into the common grave of Père-Lachaise.

²⁰ *De l'Avenir de la société*, June 28, 1831, in *Oeuvres complètes*, Société belge de librairie, Bruxelles, 1839, tome II, p. 459.

²¹ *O.c.*, II, p. 459. In the successive quotations from Lamennais, we have replaced the indication "Ibid. A. for "O.c." (n. of E.).

Maritain will not proceed otherwise; in a less optimistic exposition, which seems to reflect the disturbance produced in an authentic philosopher by being snatched by a myth, he writes: "If we try to consider them by themselves, isolating them from any erroneous context, we will say that by virtue of the obscure work of evangelical inspiration, the profane conscience has understood that human history does not turn in a circular way, but that it is oriented towards a limit and progresses in one direction"²² .

"Progress is not automatic and necessary, it is threatened and contradicted; it is not due to an advent of pure reason that would invalidate all the inheritance of the past; it is that same inheritance that grows larger groaning under the work of all the human and divine energies in man. Progress does not tend to bring back paradise tomorrow by means of Revolution, but to bring the structures of human life to better states, and that, *throughout history, until the advent of the kingdom of God and the land of the resurrected, which is beyond history. Whether or not you believe in this advent*²³ , you turn to it *if you believe in the forward march of humanity*. And what the profane conscience acquires in any case, if it does not turn to barbarism, is faith in the forward march of humanity"²⁴ .

Thus, in Maritainian thought, *human history progresses in one direction*, and if its progress is not automatic and necessary, insofar as it can be momentarily contradicted, it is so insofar as it is necessary to believe, if one does not want to veer towards barbarism, in the *forward march of Humanity*. Hence elsewhere²⁵ states that the denial of this progress prevails among those who despair of man and freedom, which constitutes "a principle of historical suicide", historical suicide that finds its equivalent in the incalculable evils that, according to Lamennais, entails, to fight "with a vain and fatal obstinacy, against the invincible power that pushes forward the human race. For nothing produces greater and more terrible calamities than the resistance to what the nature of things and beings, that is to say, to what the nature of the human race is capable of doing.

²² *Christianisme et Démocratie*, Editions de la Maison Française, New York, 1943, p. 53; Spanish edition, Biblioteca Nueva. Buenos Aires, 1955, p. 58.

²³ Underlining in quotations is ours, unless otherwise noted.

²⁴ *Christ. et Dém.* p. 53; English ed. p. 59.

²⁵ *Les Droits*, p. 46; English ed., p. 56.

God himself has made it necessary: and evil itself, the essential evil, consists only in this opposition to God"²⁶ .

And Lamennais emphasizes the *counter progress* when he beautifully writes: "This progress is not everywhere uniform, although it exists everywhere", and adds: "It comes from above, part of God, who has willed that society should advance perpetually towards a goal which it cannot reach on earth but which it must always approach; and the doctrines of error, which, in some degree have distorted its direction, have rather hindered it than helped it, and if it had been possible, they would still have stopped it completely"²⁷ .

Lamennais derives the necessity of progress from the divine providential action that presides over both the physical and the moral world and Maritain in *Réligion et Culture* links this necessity of the "*material* progress pursued in modern civilization" with the providential ends of the "Master of History" under "whose will and permission this book is written and although Satan can, at certain moments hold the pen and then it is cowardice not to see and not to call by name the evil that has been done forever, it would also be foolish not to understand that among all the possible deformations the line of being continues, the divine text is still legible to the angels, a certain good great or small has been gained (however small it may be, what does it matter, God has willed it)²⁸ . Maritain will further develop these concepts²⁹ and in *Problems of a New Christianity*, he writes: "to immobilize in a univocal form, the ideal of a culture worthy of finalizing our actions, would be to go against God himself and to fight against the supreme government of history"³⁰ .

Consequently, both in Maritain and in Lamennais the reasoning *tends* to conclude from the providential government of God the *terrestrial progress* of Humanity. And this conclusion does not follow. Because God permits evil and because, with his permission, a gain, a good, is to be brought about, it does not follow that *this good* that is to be brought about is terrestrial, nor that it is to be brought about *on earth*.

²⁶ *O.c.*, II, p. 460.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ *Réligion et Culture*, Desclée de Brouwer & Cie, Paris, 1930, p. 33.

²⁹ *Du Régime temporel et de la Liberté*, Desclée de Brouwer, Paris, 1933, pp. 32-34, 98-113, 139-159.

³⁰ *Problemas espirituales y temporales de una Nueva Cristiandad*, Ediciones Fides, Buenos Aires, 1936, p. 114.

In the most indulgent of cases, it would have to be said that Maritain does not prove this conclusion. But this conclusion is also terribly false and disastrous. Because it pretends to *justify* the evil of history; and thus Maritain writes: "To denounce a fundamental spiritual deviation in a period of culture is not to condemn this historical period. It is not condemning history. It would be as unwise for a Christian to condemn modern times as it would be for rationalists (who do not refrain from it) to condemn the Middle Ages"³¹. What is meant by saying "*history is not condemned*"; that one cannot suppress what has already been done? That we must admit *this historical path* introduced by the malice of man and that we must try, *by following it*, to arrive at *some providential salvific ends*? False, very false and pernicious. Because with this recourse to providential ends one would have to admit, for example, the justification of the Reformation, and yet the Church opposed it with the Counter-Reformation; one would have to admit the *liberalism* of the French Revolution and yet the Church opposed it with a tenacious and constant rejection, as we shall see in due course; one would have to admit *communism* now and yet *the Church* (not the progressive Catholics) opposed it with a fundamental and decisive condemnation; one would have to admit Antichrist tomorrow and yet only the elect who resist him are to be saved. The Christian cannot erase the evil that takes place in history *independently* of his will; but he must try with all his strength that his will does not cooperate to that evil, he must not want to enter in the way of that evil, *deluded* with the illusion that there he will conquer, who knows what good reserved there in the inscrutable designs of God; He must measure his *action* and formulate his *value judgment* with respect to historical events according to what should be - to *the antecedent will of God* - and not according to what happens, according to the good that God could obtain in the permission of evil.

-The consistent will of God, as theologians say, is an absurd and

It would be unrealistic to erect as a *rule of action* and a *value judgment*, things that happen because God has willed them, at least permissively, in his inscrutable designs! With this criterion we would have to be together with the Jewish priests and the Roman soldiers crucifying the Lord. For the Crucifixion of the Lord has brought such great good to the world that the Church sings, *O felix culpa!* As theologians warn, *the end* that must effectively regulate the actions of Christians is the Christian ideal of life, invariable, univocal - the Rights of God and of the Church, definitively fixed in the close of Revelation; the

³¹ *Du Régime Temporel*, p. 98.

The means that *hic et nunc* are most conducive to the attainment of that end may vary, according to one or another historical circumstance; but they are not the means but the invariable and univocal end that finalizes the action³² .

From this absurdity, erected as a rule of conduct, must follow the great and disastrous deviations of Lamennais and Maritain. Because if the Revolution is willed by God, it is willed, in some way, because otherwise it would not have happened, it is necessary to be *in the line* of the Revolution. This is the great task that Maritain has set himself in his attempt to "reconcile the vision of a Joseph de Maistre and a Lamennais in the superior unity of the great wisdom, of which Thomas Aquinas is the herald"³³ .

In the Maritainian-Mennaisian thought, one must accept, on pain of "*historical suicide*", the forward march of Humanity, and since modern civilization walks in the line of the Revolution, one must accept the path of the Revolution, which is the path of Progress. And what law points out this Progress? "This progressive movement," writes Lamennais, "has its indestructible principle in the first and fundamental law, by virtue of which humanity tends to detach itself progressively from the bonds of childhood, as the *intelligence* emancipated by Christianity grows and develops, so to speak, peoples reach the age of man: for what is true of man is also true of society, and like him, he must pass through the successive phases of life..."³⁴ . Maritain does not insist on this image of the individual man that is so dear to Lamennais. In an apparently more profound tone, he places progress in the ascent of consciousness together with an ascent of organization. "This movement," writes *Les Droits*³⁵ , "depends on a great law which might be called the double law of the degradation and the over-elevation of the energy of history, or of the mass of human activity, on which the movement of history depends. Whereas the usury of time and the passivity of matter naturally dissipate and degrade the things of this world and the energy of history, *the creative forces proper to the spirit and to freedom*, which normally have their point of application in the effort of

³² Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., *De Revelatione*, 2nd edition, p. 629.

³³ *Du Régime Temporel*, p. 147.

³⁴ *O.c.*, II, p. 460.

³⁵ *Les Droits*, p. 45; English ed. p. 55.

some - consecrated therefore to sacrifice - raise more and more the quality of this energy. The life of human societies *thus advances and progresses at the price of many losses; it advances and progresses thanks to this over-elevation of the energy of history due to the spirit and to freedom*, and thanks to technical perfections which are sometimes ahead of the spirit (from which catastrophes arise) but which by their nature require to be instruments of the spirit. Such is, in my opinion, the idea of progress that must replace both the illusory notion of necessary progress conceived in the manner of Condorcet, and that denial or aversion to progress that prevails today among those who despair of man and freedom, and which is in itself a principle of historical suicide."

By repudiating *"the illusory notion of necessary progress conceived in the manner of Condorcet"* Maritain feels "justified" as if his notion did not advocate the necessity of Progress and as if it were not as illusory as that of Condorcet, although it is not so in its own way. Neither that of a Comte or that of a Proudhon resembles that of Condorcet and yet so necessary is Progress in both and so illusory as that of a Condorcet.

Progress is necessary in Maritain because if one does not accept it, *one turns to barbarism* and surrenders oneself to historical suicide³⁶ ; *illusory* because by virtue of these principles, tomorrow, when the universal apostasy is actualized, it should be hailed as the summit of all ages and as the summit of the *forward march of Humanity*.

Progress, according to Maritain, is then produced by the creative forces of the *spirit and freedom*. But since in the individual man growth coincides precisely with the ascension of the spirit and of freedom, the Maritainian thesis coincides, on this point, with the Mennaisian one. Maritain seems to prefer to call *ascension of consciousness, prise de conscience, montée de la conscience* what Lamennais sometimes calls *affranchissement de la pensée et de la conscience* and others *developpement de l'intelligence*, or *de l'esprit*, et, par conséquent *de la liberté*³⁷ .

³⁶ *Christ. et Dém.*, p. 53 and *Les Droits*, p. 46.

³⁷ *O.c.* II, pp. 460-461.

"I have had the pleasure - writes Maritain³⁸ - of finding similar conceptions exposed, from the scientific point of view of its author, in a lecture recently delivered in Peking by the famous paleontologist Teilhard de Chardin; in it he indicates that "however old prehistory seems to make it to our eyes, Humanity is still very young"; and shows that the evolution of Humanity must be approached as the continuation of the evolution of integral life, where progress means the ascent of consciousness and where the ascent of consciousness is linked to a higher degree of organization. "If progress is to continue, it will not do so by itself; Evolution, by the mechanism of its syntheses, becomes more and more charged with freedom."

"If we place ourselves in the perspectives of the entire history of life and humanity, where it is necessary to employ a scale of duration incomparably greater than that to which we are accustomed in our ordinary experience, we reacquire confidence *in the forward march of our species*, and we understand that the law of life, leading to greater unity through greater organization, passes normally from the sphere of biological progress to that of social progress and the evolution of the civilized community."

This is the famous *prise de conscience de soi*³⁹, which seems to consist in a *human awareness of one's own worth and dignity*, which characterizes *the modern, reflexive age*, which, "with all the diminutions and losses connoted by this word, entailed on the other hand an undeniable enrichment and which must be considered an acquired gain, in the knowledge of the creature and of human things, even if this knowledge should lead to the inner hell of man as a victim of himself".

There would be no difficulty in admitting this *prise de conscience* as a psychological reality and, if you will, as a *progress* of the psychic consciousness that characterizes man and modern peoples. But Lamennais-Maritain interprets it as a *moral* progress that assigns or makes explicit new *rights* acquired by the human person, as much in the political as in the economic and social spheres.

³⁸ *Les Droits*, p. 46; English ed. p. 56.

³⁹ *Réligion et Culture*, p. 30 and then *passim* in all his works.

intellectual. These rights that Maritain analyzes especially⁴⁰ demand, as we will see by virtue of a *right* and not a simple fact, that the State renounce its *ministerial* mission in favor of the ends of the Church, that all religious confessions be, by *right*, recognized in the new Christianity, that universal suffrage and consequently political democracy, be an inalienable natural right, that the workers and peasants take the direction of their fraternal city.

It is interesting to observe how the use of these terms, *consciousness*, *spirit*, *intelligence*, *thought*, *freedom*, and those others with which they are coupled, *progress*, *liberation*, *development*, *emancipation*, *ascension*, *evolution*, which, of themselves, remain in a certain *indeterminacy*, lend themselves to be *equally* accepted by those who profess the most opposed ideologies. In them then, in their *indeterminate* use, a Catholic, a theosophist, a spiritualist, an agnostic, a communist, feel that they *coincide*. Therein lies the famous *common ground* of Maritain's fraternal city, in which "men who hold very different, even opposite, religious or metaphysical views - materialists, idealists, agnostics, Christians and Jews, Muslims and Buddhists - can agree not by virtue of an identity of doctrine, but by the analogical similarity of practical principles..."⁴¹

This is the great tactic of Masonic *enlightenment*, since the early days of the eighteenth century, a tactic that allows the union of all men, above religious and philosophical creeds. It is clear that Maritain does not renounce to "his catholic conception of life". So much he does not renounce, that his book *Du Régime Temporel et de la liberté* is devoted to fill these *abstract and indeterminate* terms, with a catholic conception of freedom, in laborious analyses that, with the help of St. Thomas, he brings to a more or less happy conclusion. Maritain's perspective and his catholic demands are thus well protected. There is no doubt also that the theses sustained there -difficult as everything that develops at the top of the third degree of abstraction- will remain filed for the readers, and instead the *prise de conscience*, and the *dignity of the human person and of freedom and progress, and the creative forces of the spirit and of freedom* will then run, wreaking havoc everywhere, thanks to their very abstract vagueness that

⁴⁰ *Les Droits*, pp. 93-138; English ed. pp. 139-167.

⁴¹ *El Pueblo*, of Buenos Aires, 13/V/1945.

allows them to be filled with the *vital* ideological charges that the words carry in common usage.

In the meantime, what has become of that doctrine - the only true and catholic one - that Maritain expounded in his *Théonas* when he said that "the dogma of the necessary progress of the human species proceeds from a very simple fact of common sense about movement, falsely interpreted and generalized by metaphysical ignavia following the law of the least intellectual effort?"⁴² . In the human species there is no other truly *human* progress but that of the perfection of the *human* being as such; and the perfection of the human being is measured by the submission of man to the divine good, in the light of eternal Wisdom. St. Thomas has established the scale of values that measures the perfection of man, in a text of *the Summa contra gentiles*⁴³ , which Maritain himself recalls⁴⁴ when he writes: "If the contemplation of the saints is placed at the summit of human life, should it not be said that all the operations of men, and civilization itself are ordered to it as to its end? It seems to be so, says (not without a certain irony perhaps) St. Thomas Aquinas. For what are works and commerce for, but that the body, being provided with the things necessary to life, may be in a state required for contemplation? What are the moral virtues and prudence for, but to procure the calm of the passions and the interior peace, of which contemplation has need? What is the whole government of civil life for, but to secure the exterior peace necessary to contemplation? "So that considering accordingly all the functions of human life seem to be at the service of those who contemplate the truth.""

In this doctrine, so limpidly expounded by the Angelic Doctor, the progress of man consists in a raising of all his activities toward the highest occupation of which he is capable, the contemplation of the First Truth. To this divine occupation man is called by the efforts and cravings of his spiritual nature, which can only there satisfy his craving for the fullness of Truth.

⁴² *Théonas*, p. 123.

⁴³ III, ch. 37.

⁴⁴ *Réligion et Culture*, p. 39.

God constitutes the principle of the essential perfection of man. Man does not perfect himself, does not acquire an increase of his being, in the same human line, but only when he progresses on the path of the possession of God. He can, yes, acquire *accidental* perfections, when he departs from God; and thus, he can, outside of Him, progress in human techniques and sciences, but then, in *the purely human line* there will be no progress... on the contrary, it can happen that these *accidental* perfections, not ordered to the *essential* perfection of man, dispose him to accelerate a process of deviation from God and, therefore, of regression. And it will happen that infatuated, with his partial and accessory progress, he will fall deeper and deeper into the abyss of abjection. Those technical perfections, for example, legitimate in themselves and which, ordered as devices for the improvement of man's material well-being, could procure a moral improvement of the human community and thus a more rapid and easier ascent of a greater number in the knowledge of God, constituted instead as having value in themselves and for themselves, as an ultimate end, cannot but disrupt the whole of man's life, making it move in the *opposite direction* to that of true perfection.

Therefore, the *progress of a civilization must be* measured by its approach to this most noble end of divine contemplation, and its departure from it measures its return. Any other progress, even if, in a certain line of partial consideration, it could be "a gain" and therefore *integrable* in the authentic human progress, as long as it is part of a regressive spiritual whole and is not *integrated* in that synthesis, it is *simply* a regression. Any attempt to assign to it the character of progress will be to the detriment of the *unity* of man.

Maritain will try to justify this *revolutionary progress* with his famous thesis of the "ambivalence of history". Suffice it to say that there is no double *progress*, there *are not two scales of human values*, as this thesis demands; it is not possible to progress from below, *in the temporal*, when one regresses *from above*: it would be like calling a tumor progress for the reason that it shares an increase of certain tissues, or to recognize a value of perfection to the city of Enoch, to the Tower of Babel or to the city of the Antichrist. Let us present here the Maritainian thesis of the *ambivalence of history*, as he expounds it in *Spiritual and temporal problems of a new Christianity*: "The first idea is that of the

ambivalence of human history, in which a double fruit ripens, whose separation will not take place until the end of history.

"In the meantime a double judgment must be passed on the various moments in the history of the world and of civilization. Even if the doctrine of "necessary progress" in the sense of Volney and Condorcet seems absurd from this point of view, we must nevertheless admit the existence of progress in history. (And how could it be otherwise, since man is spirit and flesh, therefore a progressive animal?), but of a double progress: one on the side of the animal pole of the human being and of what could be called the fecundity of corruptible matter, and the other on the side of the spiritual pole of the human being and of the fecundity that transcends matter. And this double progress takes place simultaneously"⁴⁵ .

The double progress of mankind and double Christianity

This dichotomy, operated in the unity of the human being, openly explicit in Maritain and only implicit in Lamennais, will lead one and the other to establish a *progress in history*, that of the Revolution, which is operated at the margin of the Church and will lead them to establish *two Christianities*.

"Now," says Lamennais, "ideas never go backward, and never has society, which the progressive movement of civilization pushes ceaselessly forward, been seen to go back to its sources. It is necessary to resolve to follow with it the course of things that drags it irresistibly and to submit willingly to a necessity that, even if it were in itself deplorable, would be no less invincible. But already, from what has just been said, it must have been conceived that neither humanity in general, nor Catholicism in particular, need be alarmed by this great social transformation; rather, the paternal and continuous action of God on the human race must be recognized." Lamennais thus distinguishes the progress of Humanity from the progress of Catholicism. So different is it that it is precisely in their separation, that is to say, in the opposition in which the Church is placed

⁴⁵ *Spiritual and Temporal Problems of a New Christianity*, p. 6.

In the face of the Revolution he sees, like Maritain, the tragedy of the modern world and in its conciliation he sees the health⁴⁶ .

When Lamennais speaks of the Church or of Christianity, he is not referring precisely *to the supernatural efficacy of the Holy Church* which cannot be fulfilled except by the action of the Catholic hierarchy; he is referring to the force of the *social action* of Christian ideas even when they are detached from the Catholic hierarchy.

Maritain will be more explicit in the affirmation of these two *Christianities* and thus writes⁴⁷ : "It is not about Christianity as religious creed and way to eternal life that the question is raised here, but about Christianity as leaven of the social and political life of peoples and as bearer of the temporal hope of men; it is not about Christianity as treasure of divine truth maintained and propagated by the Church, it is about Christianity as historical energy at work in the world. It is not in the heights of theology, but in the depths of profane consciousness and profane existence that Christianity acts in this way, sometimes taking heretical forms or even forms of revolt in which it seems to deny itself, as if the broken pieces of the key to paradise, falling on our life of misery and allying themselves with the metals of the earth, succeeded, better than the pure essence of the celestial metal, in activating the history of this world".

This Maritainian Christianity "leaven of the social and political life of peoples", "bearer of temporal hope", "historical energy acting in the world" is the liberation of the human race accomplished by Christianity *here below, ici bas*, of which Lamennais speaks⁴⁸ ; it is the Catholicism (Maritain's *Christian inspiration*) of modern progressive change⁴⁹ ; Christianity whose natural fruit is the emancipation of peoples⁵⁰ . We will deal with it in a different place. Here it suffices to note the monstrous aberration of this Mennaisian-Maritainian invention. One can admit the existence of *a Christian action detached from the Church* that works in the world; but one cannot admit its *justification*; insofar as it is detached, it is not Christian, but *anti-Christian*,

⁴⁶ *Christ. et Dém.*, p. 33; English ed. p. 35.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 43; English ed. p. 48.

⁴⁸ *Collected Works of Lamennais*, II, p. 431.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, II, p. 438.

⁵⁰ Ibid., II, pp. 466-467.

as Chesterton's *mad virtues* are not virtues but aberrations, and as the corrupted Christianity to which Maritain himself refers in *Trois Reformateurs*, when he had not yet invented the *ambivalence* of history is nothing but "pure anti-Christianity". "It is an axiom of the Peripatetics," he writes there⁵¹, "that every higher form contains in the state of unity the perfections divisively distributed in the lower forms. Apply this axiom to the Christian form, and you will understand that it is enough to diminish and corrupt Christianity to throw into the world semi-truths and *crazy* virtues, as Chesterton said, which were formerly embraced and which henceforth will be hated. This is why we find everywhere in the modern world degraded analogies of Catholic mysticism and shreds^B of secularized Christianity". And further on: "Christianity is not alive in the Church, if the world does not live from the living Christianity in the Church, it dies because of the Christianity that has been corrupted outside the Church"⁵².

That *secularized Christianity* that was then execrated -and rightly so-, is now exalted and is now the great engine of Humanity's Progress.

And in the acquisition of what consciousness, and in what liberation does this Progress consist?

Both Maritain and Lamennais do not conceive this liberation of conscience as *absolute*, as an agnostic or atheist thought, Kant - Marx, could imagine it, but only with respect to human powers and especially to the public power of the State.

Such is the divine work," writes Maritain, "which, according to ways as sure as they are marvelous, though often hidden from our sight, is fulfilled from century to century. The *spirit* grows; and recovering its empire over matter, the idea of right separates itself in a clearer way from the idea of force..."⁵³ and further on: "liberation of thought and of consciences subtracted from the authority of political power", and then: "it tends to realize a social order founded on the most absolute *spiritual* independence with respect to the government which will henceforth be nothing but a simple agent".

⁵¹ *Trois Reformateurs*, Librairie Plon, Paris, p. 205.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 212.

⁵³ *Collected Works of Lamennais*, II, p. 460.

regulator placed, by the national delegation, at the head of a system of free administrations, to unite them together and form a harmonious and living whole"⁵⁴ .

Maritain will write⁵⁵ : "The crucial question that arises here before human freedom concerns the path to be adopted for this progressive unification: Unification by external forces and compulsion? Unification by internal forces, that is, by the progress of moral consciousness, by the development of relations of law and friendship, by the liberation of spiritual energies? Science attests in this respect that "unification by coercion makes nothing but a superficial pseudo-unity appear. It may set up a mechanism; but it does not operate any substantive synthesis, and, consequently, it does not engender any growth of consciousness. It materializes, instead of spiritualizing. Coercion will always have a role to play in human societies; the law of progress is not to be asked of it."" And elsewhere he will explain how the progress of the human person demands that the power of the State be diminished and eliminated and give way to fraternal friendship⁵⁶ .

We could point out here the unsuspected scope of this Maritainian-Mennaisian thesis, common, moreover, to all ideologies of social agitation; at the end of this *ascent of consciousness*, humanity will be conditioned in such a way that it will be able to pass practically without authority, men *will govern themselves*. Nothing else teaches Marx, when he writes: "Human emancipation will only be realized when the real individual man will have absorbed the abstract citizen, when as an individual man in his empirical life, in his individual work, in his individual relations, he will have become a generic being and will have recognized his own forces as social forces and he himself will have organized them as such, and therefore, he will not separate from himself the social force under the form of political power"⁵⁷ .

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ *Les Droits*, p. 47; English ed. p. 57.

⁵⁶ *Principes d'une politique humaniste*, Editions de la Maison Française, New York, 1944, pp. 61-63, and *Christ. et Dém.* pp. 57-64; English ed. p. 62.

⁵⁷ *Morceaux Choisis*, 217, Quoted by CHARLES DE KONINCK, *De la Primauté du Bien Commun contre les personnalistes*, p. 183.

But both Lamennais and Maritain who place themselves in a Catholic conception of life cannot accept, evidently, that this progress be made along the path of dialectical materialism. "The goal," Lamennais will write in an article in *L'Avenir* of January 28, 1831, "towards which society tends, not only in France but everywhere where Christianity has penetrated... consists in a liberation of the intelligence more or less subjugated under all modern governments, to the brute force of power and an extension of the sphere of public and particular activity, proportionate to the developments of this same intelligence, with the necessary guarantees of the rights resulting from this new social state"⁵⁸. Maritain, for his part, from this *prise de conscience* of the person and particularly of the working person, will deduce the *new* rights of the human person in the political, economic and intellectual spheres.

Faced with the State," writes Maritain, "the temporal community and temporal power, [the human person] is free to choose his religious path at his risks and dangers; his freedom of conscience is an inviolable natural right"⁵⁹. Right of the Church and *other religious families* to the free exercise of their spiritual activity. Right of free inquiry and discussion (freedom of expression). Right of equal suffrage for all⁶⁰, with absolutely fundamental political and human value⁶¹. Right of the worker to emancipate himself from any "form of servitude more or less attenuated, as contrary to natural law taken in more or less secondary demands or aspirations and in the dynamism it entails"⁶². The main role in the next phase of evolution falls to the proletariat and its movement of historical ascent"⁶³.

These *new* rights demanded by the *moral* progress of the *prise de conscience*, operated in man are the famous rights or freedoms of Lamennais. "...The freedom of conscience or freedom of religion, full, universal, without

⁵⁸ *Collected Works of Lamennais*, II, p. 439.

⁵⁹ *Les Droits*, p. 103; English ed. p. 128.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.* p. 136; English ed. p. 162.

⁶¹ *Ibid.* p. 107; English ed. p. 135.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 131; English ed., pp. 153 ff.

⁶³ *Ibid.* pp. 129-131; English ed. p. 144; *Christianisme et Démocratie*, p. 89; English ed. p. 97. N.B.: The 1st ed. (1945) read here: "Right of the worker and peasant to lead society in the new epoch of civilization that is opening up," and the phrase indicated here is missing; the citation is the same.

freedom of the press... or freedom of speech⁶⁴ , freedoms not from God but from the State⁶⁵ , freedom of universal suffrage or "the principle of election so that it penetrates to the heart of the masses"⁶⁶ .

But, if the public power of the State is diminished, how can the social order be maintained? Both Lamennais and Maritain have set their eyes as a salutary remedy on *fraternal friendship* which, by pouring and *developing* in the profane substance of peoples, constitutes their social and political progress and activates their survival with less and less public authority.

"As intelligence grows, writes Lamennais, society is subtracted from the empire of force which is the law of the brute, it is necessary that in place of this material bond a vast bond should come to unite men whom liberty isolates and separates, and unite them voluntarily, without which they would cease to be free. This bond is nothing but love; and since Catholicism, by its very nature, develops liberty by developing intelligence, it is necessary that it should develop love proportionately; otherwise, instead of perfecting society, it would destroy it. And, in fact, there is in the bosom of Catholicism an inexhaustible, immense principle of love; and love, compendium of the law, and the whole life of Christianity, its life of time and its life of eternity. The power that Catholicism exercises, in this respect, over man... is manifest even in this age of weakening faith.... What will happen when Catholicism, entirely free, will be able without hindrance to pour out and still pour out upon this society, which is its work, its ever-increasing streams of love? Then will be successively erased, as far as possible on earth, all that separates, all that divides individuals, nations, which, politically liberated and united among themselves by voluntary obedience to a single divine spiritual power, will live a powerful and common life. Love has created the human race, love has saved it, love, consummating its earthly unity, will show it even here below as a magnificent image of what it is destined to be in another homeland"⁶⁷ .

⁶⁴ *Les Doctrines de l'Avenir*, 7 Dec. 1830 in: *Collected Works of Lamennais*, II, p. 428.

⁶⁵ *Nécessité de s'unir*, in: *Ibid*, II, 422.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, II, p. 428.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, II, p. 467.

And Maritain, writes for his part⁶⁸ : "And the profane conscience has understood that in the temporal, social and political order, not only civic friendship is, as the ancient philosophers had recognized it, the soul and the constitutive bond of the social community - if justice is essentially demanded beforehand, it is as a necessary condition that makes friendship possible - but that this civic friendship cannot in fact prevail within the social group if a stronger and more universal love, fraternal love, does not penetrate it, and if, becoming fraternity, it does not pass the limits of the social group to extend itself to the whole human race".

"Once man's heart has felt the freshness of this terrible hope, it will be forever troubled. If he ceases to recognize its sources and its superhuman demands, he risks perverting himself and returning to violence in order to impose "brotherhood or death" on everyone."

"But woe betide us if we despise it and succeed in ridding the human race of the hope of fraternity. It has been exalted by it and will lose it only by becoming more savage than before. *This hope is holy in itself; it responds to the deepest and most deeply rooted desires of human nature*; it puts souls in communion of pain and impatience with all the oppressed and persecuted; it demands heroism, and *has a divine power to transform human history*. What is conquered by the profane conscience, if it does not drift towards barbarism, is *faith in human fraternity*, the sense of social duty of compassion for man in the person of the weak and the suffering; the conviction that the political work par excellence is to make common life better and more fraternal, and to work to make the architecture of laws, institutions and customs of this common life *a house for brothers*".

A dangerous utopia, as we shall see in due course, which, by weakening the necessary function of public power to promote the rise of the community not on the path of "emancipation" but on that of virtuous life, delivers the national communities into the hands of international cliques that will establish in the universe the *legal reign of cunning and force*, as Pius X put it.

⁶⁸ *Christianisme et Démocratie*, p. 63; English edition, p. 68.

From a utopia -the Progress of Humanity- we end up in the most dreadful and terrible reality -Universal Legalized Slavery-. But this is not what interests us here. It is important to highlight the theses involved in this *dynamic* of Maritain-Lamennais' thought. Here they are: Humanity is the highest cause to whose service man must devote himself; Humanity progresses in an ever greater acquisition of conscience and freedom; this Progress, which is effected in the profane substance of the terrestrial existence of Humanity, will reach its highest degree in a foretaste of the land of the resurrected; the Church has been and is the motor of this terrestrial Progress of Humanity; this Progress coincides with the *substance* of the Revolution but^C with its accidental ideology; When this progress is stripped of the anti-Christian ideology and is catholicized, that is, when the Revolution is identified with the Church, the height of terrestrial happiness will have been reached, in which Humanity, free from servitudes, above all of the Public Power, will be united by fraternal friendship; the "new Christianity" that consists in this identification of the Revolution with the Church will reach the height of the Progress of Humanity.

The reader should note that Lamennais-Maritain does not invite the peoples to discard the Revolution and place themselves at the service of the Church for the very purpose of the Church, which is the love of God first and foremost. No. They invite the Church to submit to the cause of the Revolution, which is the Progress of Humanity, so that the peoples, growing in *conscience* and *freedom*, may realize their universal fraternity. Hence they implicitly subordinate the Church to Humanity and, if they turn to the Church, it is not for the value of supremacy that she has and for which she must be sought, but as a *means* to fulfill universal fraternity. For this reason, both Lamennais and Maritain develop their conception of "Christianity" on the basis of the Church in the formation of peoples who, since the Middle Ages, would follow an ascending path towards "the establishment of the fraternal city in which man would be liberated from misery and servitude"⁶⁹.

⁶⁹ *Les Droits*, p. 51; English ed., p. 78. *De Lamennais a...* of 1945 instead of "*Les Droits*, p. 51" reads: "*Les Droits*, p. 65" (N. of the E.).

The new Christianity

"Christianity," writes Lamennais⁷⁰ , "found the world in bondage: its political mission was to liberate it. By proclaiming the reign of intelligence, the supremacy of the *spirit* over the *flesh*, of reason over force, of right over fact, it established the sacred and immutable foundation of liberty, inseparable from order, and all the greater as order is more perfect; for order and liberty are confused in their source, infinite the one and the other in God..... Thus Christianity created first and little by little without confusion and without shocks, what is called today the people, that is to say, it made pass to the state of free men the innumerable troops of slaves that had covered the world for four thousand years"⁷¹ .

Maritain proceeds in the same way. In the chapter *The Evangelical Inspiration and the Profane Conscience* of his *Christ. et Dém.* ⁷² he first exposes the supernatural content of the Christian message and then the *political effect* (we would say) that this message has produced in the people. "What are - asks⁷³ - the thoughts and aspirations that the Christian message awakened little by little in the depths of the conscience of the people, and which advanced subterraneously for centuries before manifesting themselves? However misunderstood and deformed they may have been during that dark march in profane consciousness, what are the truths of evangelical origin to which this consciousness has henceforth linked and identified the very idea of civilization?"

And in a long and dramatic answer,^D also includes this point: "Under the evangelical inspiration in function in history, the profane conscience has understood the dignity of the people and of the man of common humanity. A faithful people, a small people of God, a real people called to participate in the work of Christ; a people as a community of citizens of a country, united under just laws; a people as a community of manual labor and as a reserve and resource of humanity for those who suffer in the face of nature. The idea that the profane conscience gradually formed of the people, comes from the encounter and the

⁷⁰ *Collected Works of Lamennais*, II, p. 463.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁷² *Christ. et Dém.* pp. 51-53; English ed. pp. 55 ff.

⁷³ *Ibid.* 53.

coalition of all these elements, and it is from the heritage of Christianity that this idea comes"⁷⁴ .

"But this new people," continued Lamennais⁷⁵ , "this nascent people, which, passionate, light, ignorant, unpredictable, offered all the characteristics as well as all the weaknesses of childhood, should, incapable of conducting and defending itself, incapable of organizing itself politically, have, like every man, its age as a minor. It was fitting that formed by a progressive education, under the watchful eye and the tender hand of the mother who had given birth to him, he should acquire little by little, what he lacked, lights, experiences and even properties (*propriétés même*); that reason and moral sense should develop in him so that he could safely exercise his natural rights: that is to say, his spiritual liberation should precede and prepare his political liberation. Here lies the whole secret of the institutions which the wisdom of Catholicism founded in the Middle Ages, and which... would have been modified, in the course of time, for the benefit of common liberty"....

In a more austere way Maritain emphasizes the same *political* action of the medieval Church in the formation of the *infant* peoples. "The medieval Church, says⁷⁶ , has directly formed and modeled political Europe because it suited her to make then arise from chaos the temporal order itself: a task of addition to which she could not refuse, but to which she has not resigned herself from the beginning without legitimate apprehension."

"Just as the child in the family⁷⁷ - writes Lamennais - is free by the father and cannot be free except by the father in obedience to a law of justice which is the guarantee of the child, so Catholicism communicated freedom to the *children of* the people by means of a higher paternity emanating from Christ, or by means of the kings subordinated to the emancipating power that directed them, watched over them, exercised over them a true social jurisdiction, to repress the abuses of force, to protect, to help the weak, to defend their rights, and

⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 55; English ed., p. 60.

⁷⁵ *Collected Works of Lamennais*, II, p. 463.

⁷⁶ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 273. [In the 1956 fr. ed. of *De Lamennais...*, it is better indicated: *Humanisme Intégral*, Aubier, p. 273. 1945, it says: p. 287, in reference to another edition (N. of the E.)].

⁷⁷ *Collected Works of Lamennais*, II, p. 463.

to preserve the great Christian family, still temporarily placed under his tutelage, from despotism and tyranny".

Maritain repeatedly speaks of the *childish naivety* of medieval Christianity. "Let us understand, then, that if, for a *naive* Christian civilization (I mean that which was based on the *native and naive* unity of man), progress towards God consisted first of all in erecting Him a throne on earth (according to the rights of His Majesty), then, for a Christian civilization, on the other hand, which can no longer be naive, and in which man has to recover his lost unity, it is necessary that he become a Christian civilization; for a Christian civilization, on the other hand, which *can no longer be naive*, and in which man has to recover his lost unity by turning in on himself under the instinct of grace, progress towards God will consist (so it seems to me), first of all, in preparing for man in this world such conditions of life that sovereign love can descend and accomplish in man and with him a divinely human work"⁷⁸ .

"We said it in our first chapter: with the absolute ambition and the unconscionable spirit of *childhood*, Christianity was then building an immense fortress on the top of which God would sit..."⁷⁹ .

This Maritainian-Mennaisian thesis of the *political function* of the Church in the Middle Ages, because of the infancy of the peoples, includes a second part which has become as famous as the first, in the circles of Catholic liberalism, namely: the peoples have already become *great*, and no longer endure nor *need* this tutelage of the Church; consequently the Church does not claim to exercise any *political* function in modern peoples and therefore, the "new Christianity" must be conceived as essentially different from medieval Christianity.

"Under medieval Catholicism - will say Lamennais⁸⁰ - which is the ever fecund and unalterable law of spiritual nature, everything grows, everything develops, by a progress without end. And as in the family, there comes a time when, by the very necessity of things, the child who has grown in intelligence becomes

⁷⁸ *Spiritual and Temporal Problems of a New Christianity*, pp. 61-62.

⁷⁹ *Humanisme Intégral*, pp. 22 and 159. 1945, citations 22 and 166, again indicative of the use of another edition in the first edition of the *De Lamennais* The French edition of 1956 evidently follows the notes of the second Castilian edition, on which we rely for this text.

⁸⁰ *Collected Works of Lamennais*, II, p. 463.

in naturally free with the same freedom as the father, there also comes a time when, by the same necessity, the peoples who have also grown in intelligence become naturally free like the fathers of the great family. It is the time of their kingship, and this time has come for Christian peoples."

In Maritain this *coming of age* of the people is linked to the thesis of the "autonomy that the profane or temporal order has attained, by virtue of a process of differentiation and which does not allow it to be considered as a *minister* of the spiritual"⁸¹, and is linked to his thesis of the coming of age of the *people itself*, the fourth estate, which he develops in his *Integral Humanism*⁸² and which he presents summarized in *Les Droits*⁸³ when he writes: "In a general way, a new epoch of civilization will have to recognize and define the rights of the human being in his social, economic and cultural functions... right in function of *the acquisition of self-consciousness*, effected by the working person and the working community. While affecting economic life and the temporal order, such acquisition is above all of a spiritual and moral order, and this is its importance. It is *the acquisition of conscience of an offended and humiliated human dignity, and the acquisition of conscience of the mission of the working world in modern history*. It means the ascent towards freedom and personality, taken in its inner reality and in its social expression, of a community of persons, of the community at the same time closer to the material bases of human life, and more sacrificed, the community of manual labor, the community of human persons affected by that work"⁸⁴.

"In a word, the historical acquisition of which we speak is the acquisition of consciousness of the dignity of labor and of the dignity of the worker, of the dignity of the human person in the worker as such. If the proletariat claims to be treated as a greater person, for that very reason it should not be helped, improved or saved by another social class. On the contrary, *the main role in the next phase of evolution falls on the proletariat and its movement of historical ascent*⁸⁵.

⁸¹ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 182. [Ed. 1945 cites p. 189 (N. of the E.)].

⁸² *Ibid.*, pp. 234 ff. [English ed. 1945 cites pp. 245-256].

⁸³ *Les Droits*, p. 114; English ed., pp. 141 ff.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 115; English ed., pp. 144 ff.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.* 116.

Hence, both Lamennais and Maritain reject from the *new Christianity* the myth of the *Holy Empire* or royal paternity.

On the other hand it is visible," continues Lamennais, "that during the centuries in which Christian peoples lived under the originally necessary regime of *royal paternity*, this still imperfect form of society resulted in an inevitable mixture of two powers, the spiritual and the temporal... Hence the institution of the social system which, from the ninth century on, took the name of the *Holy Roman Empire*: an admirable system of unity and which offered as a whole the most beautiful as well as the most profound application that the world has ever seen of the principles of law in the political constitution of society, but, at the same time, a transient system full of drawbacks.... Thus, now that the age of emancipation has arrived, nothing similar to the political system to which the Popes gave as a basis the strong sword of Charlemagne, could be established in the future and it would be a strange abuse to see anything else in the Holy Roman Empire than one of the most magnificent ruins of history"⁸⁶ .

"The inevitable mixture of two powers, the spiritual and the temporal" is, on the part of the Church, that *political function* which, according to Maritain, it assumed in the infancy of peoples, and, on the part of the temporal power, the use of its "temporal apparatus" for "spiritual" ends⁸⁷ and which in *Réligion et Culture*⁸⁸ he calls *imperialism in spiritualibus*. Maritain, who renews Lamennais' thesis, writes⁸⁹ : "In a very general way we can say that the historical ideal of the Middle Ages was subject to two dominant factors: on the one hand to the idea, or the myth (in the sense in which Georges Sorel used this word), of force in the service of God; and on the other hand to the concrete fact that temporal civilization itself was in a certain way a function of the sacred, and imperatively implied religious unity...". "We speak of the Holy Empire as a concrete historical ideal or as a historical myth, that is, as a lyrical image that orients and elevates a civilization. Considered from this point of view, it can be said that the Middle Ages have lived the ideal of the Holy Roman Empire (and died for it)...". "It can be said that in the Middle Ages temporal authority was..."

⁸⁶ *Collected Works of Lamennais*, II, p. 465.

⁸⁷ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 156. [Ed. 1945: quote p. 162 (N. of E.)].

⁸⁸ *Réligion et Culture*, p. 59.

⁸⁹ *Spiritual and Temporal Problems*, pp. 117, 118, 126 and 127.

conceived first of all according to the type of paternal authority in the already sacred conceptions of the family, in those conceptions of which an example is found in the Roman age of the *paterfamilias*, which the Christian faith sublimated, by linking it to the idea of universal divine paternity".

"The consecration of the king makes him the father of the multitude, and by attesting that he governs the temporal in the name of the Sovereign King, he confirms his natural authority as head of the earthly city in the order of grace. The last flashes of all the political thought of the Middle Ages are embodied in Joan of Arc, when she puts so much energy and obstinacy to obtain the consecration of the king, when she obtains from Charles VII that he yields the holy kingdom to Christ, to give it back to him solemnly on his behalf so that he may have it.

"for the benefit".

Finally, if Lamennais says: "*the concord of the priesthood and the empire* did not exist in any epoch, but in the books in which it was treated directly", Maritain will say: "the civilization of the Middle Ages, as great and beautiful as it was, and even more beautiful in the purified memories of history than in the lived reality"⁹⁰ Maritain will say: "the civilization of the Middle Ages, as great and beautiful as it was, and even more beautiful in the purified memories of history than in the lived reality..."⁹¹

What to think of these doctrines on the formation of peoples, by the Church with its political tutelary action exercised in its infancy and of the maturity, achieved now, which demands *de jure* an adaptation of the Church according to the new condition? As these doctrines form the very substance of the *new Maritainian Christianity*, their critical analysis will be formulated in due course. Here it suffices to state the truth that corresponds to these errors. It is quite true that the Church formed the peoples of Christian Europe. The opening lines of Leo XIII's *Immortale Dei* make this clear: "*The immortal work*," says the Pope, "of the merciful God is his Church, which, although of herself and by her own nature she is concerned with the salvation of souls and their happiness in heaven, yet even *within the domain of things that are decayed and earthly she procures so many and such great goods* that neither more in number nor better in quality would result if the first and principal object of her institution were to ensure the prosperity of this present life. In truth, wherever the Church has set

foot, it has done at once

⁹⁰ *Collected Works of Lamennais*, II, p. 465.

⁹¹ *Réligion et Culture*, p. 40.

to change the state of things; it informed the customs with virtues previously unknown and *implanted in the civil society a new culture*, that to the peoples that received it, it advanced and exalted over the others by the gentleness, the equity and the glory of the companies". But it is entirely false and pilgrim that the Church has formed them with a *supplementary political action*. *The Church* formed them *by maintaining herself in her spiritual sphere*, a sphere so wide and deep that by penetrating into the souls of Christians, she sanctifies and consolidates all the states and conditions of life according to that which St. Augustine so beautifully teaches and which Leo XIII adduces in the aforementioned encyclical, when speaking to the Church he says: "Thou instructest and teachest gently the children, bizarrely the young, with peace and calm the aged, as the age suffers, not only of the body, but also of the spirit. Thou subduest the wife to the husband with chaste and faithful obedience, not as a bait of passion, but for the propagation of offspring and for the union of the family. Thou puttest the husband before the wife, not that he may affront the weaker sex, but that he may pay her homage of loyal love. Thou makest children to live to parents, but freely, and parents to rule over children, but lovingly and tenderly. *Citizens to citizens, peoples to peoples, all men to one another, without distinction or exception, you bring them near, reminding them that, more than social, the bond that unites them is fraternal*; because from one first man and one first woman the universality of the human lineage was formed and descends. Thou *teachest kings to look after the good of the people, and the people to pay obeisance to kings*. You carefully show to whom praise and honor is due, to whom affection, to whom reverence, to whom fear, to whom consolation, to whom warning, to whom exhortation, to whom the soft word of correction, to whom the hard word of rebuke, to whom torture, and you also show in what way, as it is true that not everything is due to all, it is necessary to owe charity to all and to no one grievance".

But these effects of the Church's influence, which, in reaching the whole of man, also reach his profane-temporal structures, are *necessarily* produced when societies submit to the Church and cease to be produced when they are subtracted from her. Therefore, the same *spiritual influence* that saved Europe in the Middle Ages, even as a temporal society, can save it now; the same, therefore, must be the relationship of peoples with the Church, then and now.

In the subtraction of the peoples from the *spiritual* government of the Church consists the Revolution, which, first waged by the kings, expelled the Church from temporal life; then waged by the bourgeoisie, it expelled the kings and led them to the scaffold; and now waged by those who claim to interpret popular aspirations, it will put an end to the remnants of the bourgeoisie in order to deliver the peoples to the master of the world. *"For what cause,"* asks the Psalmist (Psalm II), *"have the nations raged and the peoples devised vain schemes? The kings of the earth have joined themselves together; and the princes have joined themselves together against the Lord and against his Christ. Let us break, they said, their bonds and shake off their yoke from us"*. This is the true history of the modern centuries that will last until the Lord wills to fulfill the part that continues and that says: *"But he who resides in heaven will mock them; the Lord will mock them"*.

What Maritain insinuates that "the medieval Church directly modeled political Europe because it was necessary to make arise from chaos the temporal order itself..., but that today the temporal organism exists highly differentiated...."⁹², he forgets that what exists today is a monstrous universal State on the one hand and a total anarchy on the other, but that is not called an *organism*, that is a frightful chaos that the Pontiff Pius XII in^E the *Summi Pontificatus* compares to the darkness that invaded the entire surface of the earth when they crucified the Lord, chaos so dreadful that the people "in turning away from the doctrine of Christ were not fully aware that they were being deceived *by the false mirage of brilliant phrases proclaiming that separation as liberation from the bondage in which they had previously been held*; nor did they foresee the bitter consequences of the lamentable change between *the truth that liberates and the error that reduces to slavery*; nor did they think that, renouncing the law of God, infinitely wise and paternal, and the unifying and ennobling doctrine of Christ's love, they were surrendering themselves to the will of a poor and changeable human prudence: *they spoke of progress, when they regressed; of elevation, when they degraded; of ascension to maturity, when they enslaved themselves*; they did not perceive the vanity of every human effort to substitute something equal to the law of Christ: *they infatuated themselves in their thoughts*."

In short, that what Pius XI teaches is as true today as it was in the presumed infancy of peoples: "the Church exercises her ministry of the word through *priests*, suitably distributed in the various grades of the Church, and through

the *priesthood*.

⁹² *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 273. [Ed. 1945¹ : quotation p. 287.]

the sacred hierarchy, whom he sends everywhere as indefatigable heralds of the good news, which alone can preserve, or establish, or revive true civilization"⁹³ .

Lamennais forged, the first, the project of "the new Christianity" that would not be based on *royal paternity*, on the *concord of priesthood and empire* or, as Maritain would later hatefully say, on the "myth of force at the service of God" but "on an immense development of freedom", or on the "myth of the realization of freedom".

"A new social order," writes Lamennais, "founded on an immense development of freedom which Catholicism has made necessary by developing in souls the true notion and feeling of right; and because it is its principle in what is salutary and in conformity with the law of progress which governs humanity, it will constitute for it a great epoch of renewal, and, so to speak, the sign of the victories by which, subjecting the hitherto rebellious nations to its law, it will finally constitute the human race in unity."⁹⁴ .

And on December 22, 1830, he published in *L'Avenir* an article entitled *The Pope* in which, while mourning the recently deceased Pius VIII, he glorified the future Pope, not yet known - *to you whom we cannot yet name by name, our faith greets you in advance* - and who was later Gregory XVI, and to whom was reserved a providential mission that never, "since the time when the liberation of the universe is accomplished, has there been a more elevated one; a new era will begin for Christianity, an era of health, strength and glory, an era of such glory that all past glory will pale before its splendor"⁹⁵ .

Maritain speaks of his third Christian age which "would be under a temporal regime, a new historical heaven... in which integral humanism would begin to develop, the humanism of the Incarnation... and which would involve no other theocracy than that of divine love"⁹⁶ .

⁹³ Pius XI, *Ad Catholici sacerdotii*.

⁹⁴ *Collected Works of Lamennais*, II, p. 464.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, II, p. 431.

⁹⁶ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 248 [Ed. 19451: quote p. 260].

While Maritain says that the present civilization is a "very worn dress, in which it is not possible to sew new pieces and that it is a question of *a total recasting and as substantial, of a renversement of the principles of culture*" ^{97F} . Lamennais wrote: "Just as on the rubble of the Roman Empire, and while the barbarians crossing from north to south, passed and passed over these vast ruins, he built the imposing edifice of the society of the Middle Ages, so on the remains of this worn out building, he will raise another society which will be nothing but the expression of the state that by a progressive development, has reached, under his influence, the human race, proportional development of freedom: For man, like the child, must grow in freedom, as he grows in intelligence. Is it not in this way that originally Christianity, fertilizing little by little the primitive germs of the true and the good buried until then in human nature, abolished slavery and created what among us is called the people? What is happening now, whatever difference the mixture of a different but weaker principle may make, is, in the end, but the prolongation of this liberating action which will extend in future centuries, until man, having gone the whole circle of his possible perfection here below, transforms himself, according to the laws of his immortal nature, to enter into a new order of development which will never end because it is fulfilled in the infinite heaven of eternity"⁹⁸ .

The condemnation of Lamennais

What answer was to be found in the Roman Chair, the *pillar and foundation of Truth*⁹⁹ , to these hopes of unsuspected triumphs assured to the conciliation of the Church with the Revolution?

In response, Gregory XVI, in his encyclical *Mirari Vos* of August 15, 1832, condemned some of the doctrines defended by *L'Avenir*. Thus

⁹⁷ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 212. [Ed. 1945¹ : quote p. 222].

⁹⁸ *Collected Works of Lamennais*, II, p. 431.

⁹⁹ I Tim., III, 15.

Cardinal Pacca informed Lamennais of this by order of the Holy Father, in a letter enclosed with the encyclical, a copy of which was sent to him at ^{100G}.

It condemns the attempt at a *new Christianity*, along the path of *liberty*, which, from then on, was to take shape in the imagination of Catholic liberals.

The Pope condemns a *Christianity that is essentially different from the medieval one*, recalling that *"the universal Church rejects all novelty and that, according to the advice of St. Agathon, Pontiff, nothing should be taken away from those things that have been defined, nothing changed, nothing added, but they should be kept pure in word and meaning"*. He also recalls that to the Roman Pontiff alone *"has been entrusted the constitution of the canons, and that it belongs to him alone and to no other to judge of the ancient decrees, as St. Gelasius says: to weigh the decrees of the canons, to measure the precepts of his predecessors in order to temper, with diligent consideration, those things whose modification the necessity of the times demands"*. Compare the reader this teaching with what Maritain teaches^H about the *"collaboration of the philosopher and the man of action"* to fix the *dynamic image of the future Christianity*.

The Pope condemns the attempt to erect a naturalistic city by reproaching *"the desires of those who try to separate Church and State and to break the mutual concord of the priesthood with the empire. It is known in truth, that the lovers of false liberty shuddered at the concord, which always gave magnificent results, between sacred and civil things"*.

The Pope condemns the attempt to pretend a Christianity that can be structured without the help of the subordinate temporal power, as an instrument of the spiritual ends of the Church. *"Let the princes,"* he says, *"help these our desires for the good success of sacred and profane things with their power and authority, for they received it not only for the temporal government, but also for the defense and custody of the Church. Let them understand that whatever is done for the good of the Church is at the same time directed to the good and peace of the empire, and let them be more and more persuaded that they must hold the cause of faith in higher esteem than that of the kingdom, and that they will be greater if, as St. Leo says, the crown of faith is added to their crown of kings. Since they have been constituted as fathers and guardians of the people, they will give them true welfare and peace of mind, if they direct their care especially to the cause of faith."*

¹⁰⁰ *Du régime temporel*, p. 131.

to preserve intact the religion of that Lord whose power is expressed by that of the psalm: King of kings and Lord of those who dominate".

The Pope condemns the attempt to build a *libertarian city* by execrating the *"absurd and erroneous sentence - or rather delirium - which affirms and defends freedom of conscience and freedom of the press. This pestilent error makes its way, shielded by the immoderate freedom of opinion which, to the confusion of sacred and civil things, spreads everywhere, and the imprudence of some goes so far as to assure that great benefit for the cause of religion is derived from it. And what worse death for the soul than the freedom of error," said St. Augustine. And certainly, that broken the brake that restrains men in the ways of truth and inclining precipitously to evil by their corrupt nature, we consider already open that abyss from which, as St. John saw, rose smoke that darkened the sun and threw locusts that devastated the earth"*.

The Pope condemns the attempt to build *"an indifferent city"* by reproaching those *"who think that one goes everywhere to the port of salvation"*, because it must be kept in mind, *"that according to the Savior's sentence those who are not with Christ are against Christ and that those who do not gather with Christ scatter miserably, so that those who do not have the Catholic faith and do not keep it whole and undefiled will infallibly perish"*.

The Pope condemns the *democratizing city* by rejecting *"certain doctrines which destroy the faith and submission that is due to princes, thereby fostering the fire of rebellion; great care must be taken that the people do not be led astray from the path of goodness. Let all men know that, as the Apostle says, all authority comes from God, and all things are ordained of God himself. Therefore, he who resists the authority resists the ordination of God and condemns himself. Therefore, those who by clumsy machinations of rebellion turn away from the faith which they owe to princes, wishing to wrest from them the authority which they possess, say how all divine and human rights cry out against them."*

Gregory XVI does not fail to warn, as later Pius IX, Leo XIII, and Pius X will do in their condemnation of the *Sillon*, that *"We must seek the origin of so many calamities in the simultaneous action of those societies to which, as in an immense bilge, all that is sacrilegious, subversive and blasphemous has ended up in the accumulation of heresy and impiety in all times"*, referring, with all evidence, to the secret societies of Freemasonry¹.

But Lamennais, in whose subconsciousness the cause of Humanity prevailed over the cause of the Church, was terribly deluded to discern, in a healthy practical judgment, the gravity of his errors. Later, in *Affaires de Rome*, where he refers the vicissitudes of this his vexatious conflict with the Roman Curia he will want to justify himself, and thus he will write: "Convinced that the liberty to which Christian peoples aspire, and which will certainly constitute *the basis of future society, far from being opposed to Christianity*, is but its direct consequence, its necessary development, they [those of *l'Avenir*] believed to serve humanity, which suffers from its own efforts and from the resistances they encounter, by trying to bring back to its primitive source the sentiment, everywhere so lively, which pushes nations to emancipate themselves. For it is not enough, it is clear, to overthrow the oppressors... the true, the only remedy, God has placed in the *evangelical law* destined to unite men by *a fraternal affection*, which makes all live in each one and each one live in all.

"*The Avenir* also intended to defend the Catholic institution... it thought that it should *extend its almost dry roots in the bosom of humanity itself* to drink there again the sap it lacked, and that *by uniting its cause to that of the peoples*, it could recover its extinguished vigor, regularize the social movement.... *The universal fraternity* proclaimed by Jesus suddenly reanimated the withered germs that God had originally deposited.... Why, after eighteen centuries, did [the people] dissociate themselves from this Church if not because, at least in appearance, she had practically departed from the maxims in which she had lived, in her origin, such a thriving life? And what means to become again what it was in its beginnings, to win back again, with the confidence of the popular masses its influence over them, but to regain strength at its source, to identify its interests, in so far as it had them of its own, with the interests of the human race, to come to the aid of its needs, to help it to develop in all its aspects and in all its consequences, now applicable, *the Christian principle of equality of right*, the realization of which constitutes the order without which no liberty and the liberty without which no order?"¹⁰¹ . The reader can recognize here Maritain's thought when he says ^{102J} : "It is not a privileged juridical situation but *an equal Christian right*, in an equal right inspired by its own spirit.... It is not by granting the Church a favored treatment,

¹⁰¹ See *Affaires de Rome*, in the work cited above, by Lamennais, II, pp. 515-516.

¹⁰² *Les Droits*, p. 43; English ed., p. 51.

by seeking to win her by means of temporal advantages paid at the price of her freedom, but by demanding more of her - by requiring *priests to go to the masses and to join in their life in order to spread in their midst the leaven of the Gospel* and to open the treasures of the liturgy to the world of work and its feasts, demanding of the religious orders that they cooperate with the works of social assistance and education of the civil community, of their lay militants and their youth organizations that they help the moral work of the nation and develop in social life the sense *of liberty and fraternity*".

A century after Lamennais, Maritain with his "new Christianity" renews the attempt of conciliation of the Revolution with the Church as in the time of Pius IX would do the same the Catholic liberalism, with its great leader Montalembert and as in the time of Leo XIII the Christian democrats and as in the time of Pius X Marc Sangnier with the *Sillon*. But this will not be without a profound and harmful alteration of the very concept of Christianity, of the relationship between the natural and supernatural order, without a glorification of liberty and democracy, in a word, without falling into the orbit of the city of the Revolution which, in the end, is not, as Gregory XVI insinuates, but "that open abyss from which, as St. John saw, smoke rose and darkened the sun and cast out locusts that devastated the earth. (Apoc., IX, 2).

What a terrible and decisive error! To undertake the path of the Revolution, in the name of the Gospel, when in reality it leads only to the enthronement of the "*son of perdition*" of which the Apostle speaks! How does Maritain explain such a grave error? He himself deciphers the enigma¹⁰³ when he writes: "One can believe that one of the causes that have most seriously weakened many modern Catholics and favored in them liberalism, Americanism, modernism, etc., is the infiltration in their souls of the Masonic dogmas of the necessary Progress, and of humanitarian optimism, a sentimental pseudo-idea that responds to the secret desire of nature to accept the accomplished facts and that has no equal to cloud the judgment".

But no one - not even philosophers - can avoid the logic of things, a logic that Maritain has strongly exposed in his *Théonas* condemning himself

¹⁰³ *Antimoderne*, p. 207. [*L. a M.* ed. fr. indicates to which edic. this pagination corresponds: Nouvelle édition. Revue des Jeunes, 1922].

in advance: "He who says progress, says change. Progress being absolutely necessary and the law of progress having since then, as we have seen, an absolutely universal dominion, that which is called foundation and principle whether in the order of knowledge or in that of moral life, must evidently change like everything else... from whence it follows that the law of progress, demanding the constant change of the foundations and principles admitted in the past, also demands that the movement of humanity towards the best, be accomplished by an uninterrupted renewal of subversions, therefore of destructions.... We should say that progress, as progress, supposing as we have recognized it the conservation, under one form or another, of the gains acquired by the past, is profoundly *conservative* and positive; but that Necessary Progress, as expressing a pretended law metaphysically necessary to the universal domain, is essentially *revolutionary* and negative. The Mythical Idea of Progress thus devours real progress"¹⁰⁴ . This is how Maritain wisely expressed himself. This is why his "New Christianity" devours real Christianity as the Revolution devours Christian Civilization.

¹⁰⁴ *Théonas*, pp. 140-142.

THE NEW CHRISTIANITY ESSENTIALLY DIVERSE

*Civilization is not yet invented, nor is the city.
for building in the clouds.*

(Pius X in *El Sillon*).

With the condemnation of *Christian democratism* by Pius X in his letter of the *Sillon*, the *libertarian and democratist* conception of a Christian civilization disappears from the Catholic environment, at least as a current thought. Maritain, surrounded by a well-deserved universal prestige as a Thomistic philosopher, rehabilitates this position, back in 1930, with his *Réligion et Culture*.

Until then, Maritain had upheld the traditional position of the Church in such thoughtful works as *Antimoderne*, *Trois Réformateurs* and *Primauté du Spirituel*. "It is important," he wrote¹⁰⁵, "to integrate the immense material of life contained in the modern world, but it is fitting to *hate the modern world* considered in that which it looks upon as its *proper and distinctive glory: independence with respect to God*. We hate therefore the bourgeois revolutionary iniquity that envelops and vitiates civilization today as we hate the proletarian revolutionary iniquity that wants to annihilate it. It is for God and not for modern society that we want to work... Finally, it is not from the efforts of men that we expect health but from Him of whom it has been said: "*Nec enim aliud sub coelo nomen datum est hominibus, in quo oporteat nos salvos fieri*".

And in *Trois Réformateurs*, which appeared in 1925, Maritain has pointed out in three profound studies on Luther, Descartes and Rousseau, the milestones of this impious independence of the modern world. "Such is the secret of our life as men that the poor modern world ignores: we do not conquer our soul except on condition of losing it, a total death is required before we can find ourselves. And when we have truly stripped ourselves, when we have lost and torn ourselves away from ourselves, then everything belongs to us who belong to Christ and Christ belongs to us who belong to Christ and Christ belongs to us who belong to Christ.

¹⁰⁵ *Antimoderne*, p. 216. [*L. a M.* ed. fr. indicates edic.: *Revue des Jeunes*, 9^e mille, 1922].

and God himself is our good. But *if we pretend to find our soul and if we take our self for our center, our substance dissipates*, we pass into the service of the blind forces of the universe"¹⁰⁶ .

Maritain writes¹⁰⁷ : "A Christian nation *cannot* consolidate its greatness on principles contrary to the laws of the Gospel, and by sacrificing the common interests of the Christian republic. What has come out of it for France and for the world (because this sin, far from being peculiar to France, has been as great or greater elsewhere, it is the lot of the whole modern world) proceeded from an implacable logic. It has often been observed that the same principles *of insurrection of the part against the whole* which were invoked against the pope, must necessarily serve against kings, and, later, against the fatherland itself. Nogaret is a cousin of Robespierre and Lenin. *The refusal to submit to the Church must necessarily entail the refusal to submit to God*, and to recognize his rights over the State as such. The royalist decrees of the Parliaments are the anticipated drafts of^K the secular laws.

"Whether right or left, the histories of France need, from this point of view, a serious revision. We have said it many times, the murderous ideas that inform the world that came out of the Reformation and the Revolution, *altering the normal developments that continued on the other hand, are the cadaverous forms of the corruption of the Christian world*, progressively destroyed by the claim of absolute independence (*aseity*) of the politicians and philosophers, of the kings and peoples of the modern age. Five hundred years ago, our death began".

Starting from the assumption that "the proper and distinctive glory" of the modern world was its independence with respect to God, Maritain, who only wanted to place himself within the most rigorous Catholic principles, could not but "*hate the modern world*", even if he recognized in it good values that should be saved.

The world, although enclosing some values *accidental* good, was nevertheless to be branded as evil because of the perverse *essence* which

¹⁰⁶ *Trois Reformateurs*, p. 37.

¹⁰⁷ *Primauté du Spirituel*, p. 115.

constituted. It was then utopian and dangerous to think of its conciliation with the Church. This was the position of the *Syllabus*.

Quite another is the attitude he defends in 1930^L. "In short, writes¹⁰⁸, it seems that by withdrawing into himself, man has suffered, as if in spite of himself, the movement of introversion proper to the spirit; he has entered within himself; and not to seek God. A general progress in *self-awareness* has thus characterized the modern era. While the world turned away from spirituality par excellence and from this love which is our true end to go towards external goods and towards the exploitation of sensible nature, the universe of immanence opened, sometimes through low doors, a subjective deepening discovered to science, to art, to poetry, to the very passions of man, and to his vices his *own spirituality, the demand for freedom* became all the more acute the more it departed from the true conditions and from the true notion of freedom. Briefly, by virtue of the ambivalence of history, the *reflex age*, with all the diminutions and losses connoted by this word, entailed *an undeniable enrichment*, to be considered as *an acquired gain, in the knowledge of the creature and of human things*, even if this knowledge was to lead to the inner hell of man, a victim of himself. *This dark path never ceases to have an exit and the fruits collected in passing have been incorporated into our substance*".

Here Maritain no longer emphasizes this "independence from God" as a *formal* constituent of the modern world, and consequently no longer directs the intention of his energies to denounce this essential perversity so that man understands that he cannot, *by this path of the modern world*, attain health, but must be *converted*, that is to say, to turn away from that good which he loves in a disorderly way, and to turn to the unchangeable good, from which he had ungodly and wrongly separated himself, in order to love in it in an orderly way, integrating into the essential and unchanging order of things those diminished goods and even progress which might *accidentally* be linked to the modern world; now, on the other hand, he emphasizes this "taking hold of one's own conscience," this "gain acquired in the knowledge of the creature and of human things" and insinuates them as a *formal* constituent of the modern world; considering instead that *independence from God* as something *accidental* although

¹⁰⁸ *Réligion et Culture*, p. 30.

of tragic consequences because it prevents him from realizing his deep and authentic aspirations.

Consequently, it is no longer necessary to "hate the modern world" as he said in *Antimoderne* but, on the contrary, it is necessary to approach it with great compassion and especially to bring it closer to the Church, because the modern world "aspires without knowing it to a civilization whose principles St. Thomas indicates"¹⁰⁹. Note that Maritain in his later works continues to attack the *atheistic* positions of the modern world, the atheistic liberalism of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and atheistic communism, but he does not attack the modern world, as such, he believes that it can *persevere* if it believes in God, nor does he attack liberalism, as such, that is, in its attempt to *reach the Christian order by the path of public rights or freedoms of conscience and press*; Nor does he attack communism in its fundamental tendency of wanting to *emancipate man from all servitude*; he does attack it for its atheism. Thus, for example,¹¹⁰ writes: "These errors, which responded to the advent of class and bourgeois ideologies, far from being in league with democracy, are destructive of it".

This *misunderstanding* will allow him to maintain, with the appearance of logic, a disastrously misleading position. For, on the one hand, if the modern world is bad because it is atheistic, if it were baptized, that is, if it were stripped of atheism, it would seem that it could already be good. And then, by continuing along the *same lines of the modern world or of the Revolution* - without abandoning their aspirations for emancipation from all servitude, without renouncing modern public liberties, and the desire for self-government - they would return to the Church and to the love of God. Herein lies the dismal illusion. Because this path, even if for the use of Catholics it is varnished or impregnated with a "Catholic" *ideology*, is *intrinsically* perverse and leads only to ruin. Maritain's thesis is then an *ideology* which, although opposed to the Rousseauian, Marxist or Prudhonnian *ideologies*, *substantially* coincides with them in the line of the Revolution. And for the same reason it is profoundly *utopian* insofar as it pretends to reach a goal.

-Christianity - intrinsically impossible in *this way*; and it is also profoundly *disastrous*, insofar as, in fact and by the internal logic of things

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.* p. 41.

¹¹⁰ *Christianisme et Démocratie*, p. 81; English ed., p. 88. [The fr. ed. probably quotes an earlier ed.]

is obliged to "escort", in the expression of Pius X, those perverse ideologies.

This and no other was the position of Lamennais, although other motives may have determined him to adopt this position. Lamennais had the very certain intuition that modern society, founded on liberty and democracy, was a definitive fact. In *Affaires de Rome*, where he recounts in great detail the difficulties he encountered in the Roman Curia, he clearly manifests his thinking: "Convinced," he says, "that the liberty to which Christian peoples aspire, and which will certainly constitute the basis of future society, far from being opposed to Christianity, is but its direct consequence, its necessary development, they [those of *L'Avenir*] believed to serve humanity which suffers from its own efforts and from the resistances they encounter, by trying to channel back to its primitive source the sentiment, everywhere so alive, which pushes nations to become independent."¹¹¹ .

And both Lamennais and Maritain, starting from the assumption that "this becoming independent", this "becoming aware of one's own conscience" contains a certain good, immediately concluded its reconcilability with the Church. "Does this mean
Maritain says¹¹² -that the Christian conception of culture has with the contemporary world only a relationship of incompatibility? That it proposes us no other ideal than the past ideal, definitively swallowed up in history, of medieval times? It is necessary to say, once again, that the course of time is irreversible". Lamennais, for his part, said beautifully and forcefully: "We have never seen society, which the progressive movement of civilization is leading unceasingly forward, go back to its source. It is therefore necessary to resolve to follow with it the course of things that irresistibly drags it and to submit willingly to a necessity that, even if it were in itself deplorable, would not be for that reason less invincible. But already, from what we have just said, it must be admitted that neither humanity in general nor Catholicism in particular need be alarmed at this great social transformation, where the paternal and continuous action of God on the human race must rather be acknowledged"¹¹³ .

¹¹¹ *Collected Works of Lamennais*, II, p. 515.

¹¹² *Réligion et Culture*, p. 40. [*The M ed. fr. cites p. 39*].

¹¹³ *Collected Works of Lamennais*, II, p. 462.

And Maritain, who also invokes the providential action of God¹¹⁴, continues: "Christian wisdom does not propose a return to the Middle Ages; it *invites us to move forward... towards* a Christianity in which "the ideal or myth of the '*realization of freedom*'" has replaced the ideal or myth of strength in the service of God"¹¹⁵.

Criticism of this position

Maritain's position towards the modern fact has undergone a visible change. From a fundamentally irreconcilable attitude he has passed to a fundamentally reconcilable one. Is this his second position admissible? We believe it is not, and we also believe that in the *value judgment* formulated on the *modern fact* lies the decisive question on the problem of liberalism and Catholicism.

We warn that it is not a question of affirming that everything *modern* is good or bad. No one can accept such a simplism, just as no one can accept that the traditional regime of Christian civilization has not involved, in fact and accidentally, serious deficiencies. What is at issue is the following: "Is the modern world, in that which constitutes its *essence*, acceptable to a Catholic or not? A question which, as we can see, depends on this other question: "What is the *essence* of the modern world?"

And here it is enough for us to admit that its *essence* is constituted by the "*prise de conscience*", "the universe of immanence", "the demand for freedom", "emancipation itself". If the modern world *formally* seeks this, that is to say, if it formally places its happiness in these values, the modern world is irremediably perverse. Because it has to seek itself as an end; it has to place in *freedom* as such, that is, in the pure breaking of *servitudes*, in the destruction of bonds, as bonds, the measure of its perfection. And everything must be conditioned to *freedom*, erected as an end. And it would be of no use to justify his condition if he were to admit God, because he would admit him insofar as he would help his freedom and would reject him insofar as he could

¹¹⁴ *Réligion et Culture*, pp. 33 and 40. [ed. 1948 and *L a M* ed. fr. cite only p. 40].

¹¹⁵ *Du régime temporel*, p. 122. [*L a M* ed. 1948 adds *Religion et Culture* p. 40 again here and *L a M*

ed. fr.: *Du régime temporel*, p. 124 and *Religion et Culture* p. 40].

contrary to it. For if it were to admit God as the only and supreme end, it would have to renounce its own essence, which is nourished by freedom, sought as an end. And it is not to be argued that the modern world seeks *freedom*, thus in the abstract, but since freedom is God, the modern world, without knowing it, seeks God. Everything would be to show it that the *freedom* it seeks is to be found in God, so that it would have to turn away from the mistaken path pointed out to it by the sophists of the eighteenth century and, without abandoning the aspirations that urge it on, it would take the path of its true greatness. For although in God there is freedom, it does not formally constitute God. God is the Fullness of Being, the Fullness of Truth, the Fullness of Good: "While freedom is not conceivable without the intelligence that deliberates, intelligence is conceivable without freedom; intelligence is therefore first, freedom is derivative"¹¹⁶. Freedom is always and necessarily in function of wisdom according to the metaphysics of the Angelic Doctor summarized in that which says: "The root of all freedom lies in reason"¹¹⁷. *Essentially conditioned* freedom is found in God to the extent that the fullness of Truth consents to it. But Truth as Being and as Good is found in all fullness, without any condition. Hence the word of the Lord: "*If ye continue in my doctrine, then are ye truly my disciples. And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free*"¹¹⁸.

Then only the fullness of truth liberates. Truth sought as an end. God sought as an end. Man *is liberated* when he seeks his own integration in the fullness of Truth which is God. A path diametrically opposed to the search for pure freedom, to emancipation from bondage, for according to the teaching of the Savior: "*Whoever does not bear his cross and follow me is not worthy of me. Whoever seeks his soul will lose it, and whoever loses his soul for my sake will find it*"¹¹⁹. It is clear that the divine way of Truth - and only it - leads to true freedom according to that of St. Paul: "*For the Lord is Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom*"¹²⁰.

But if instead of seeking Truth, one seeks *freedom* as such, that is, one's own emancipation, one's own dignity, one walks towards perdition. "Lucifer,

¹¹⁶ Garrigou-Lagrange, *ibid.* p. 353, 604-759.

¹¹⁷ *De veritate*, q. XXIV, 2.

¹¹⁸ John, VIII, 32.

¹¹⁹ Mt., X, 38-39.

¹²⁰ II Cor., III, 17.

the first among the angels - says St. Bonaventure¹²¹ - presuming on his own good, he desired his own excellence, wanting to be preferred to others; for this reason he fell with those who consented with him".

Adam's sin also consisted in this craving for one's own dignity, taken as an end in itself¹²² .

That way leads to ruin. This is why the Savior taught: *"whoever wants to save his soul will lose it"*¹²³ . St. Peter condemned the libertarians of his time when he said: *"promising them freedom when they themselves are slaves of corruption"*¹²⁴ .

Hence the modern world, whose *distinctive and proper note*, according to Maritain himself, is constituted by this independence with respect to God, this essential and permanent rebellion to the Divine Truth, in front of which it stands as a personality that finds in itself the fullness of knowing and determining itself, is essentially and without remedy perverse. For this reason the greatest exponent of the modern world is Kant, who makes of man a moral personality who finds in himself his complete end. "From now on, the reasonable animal will only rely on itself, its cornerstone will no longer be Christ. The spirit of absolute independence, which, in the end, leads him to claim for himself the *aseity* and which can be called the spirit of the anti-Christian Revolution, is introduced victoriously in Europe with the Renaissance and the Reformation, subtracts to the Christian order, there the sensibility and all the curiosities of the spirit, here the religious spirituality and the will, and aims to replace everywhere the cult of the three divine Persons by the cult of the human self. Repressed in the seventeenth century, launched in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to the conquest of the universe, served with perseverance and skill by the Masonic counter-Church, it succeeds in removing God from all that is the center of power or authority among the peoples".

¹²¹ *Breviloquium*, c. 6.

¹²² II. II, q. 163.

¹²³ Lk., IX, 24.

¹²⁴ II, letter III, 19.

This analysis of the modern world that Maritain formulated¹²⁵, when his intelligence, both speculative and practical, was preserved intact from revolutionary infiltrations, coincides with what the Church, with admirable perseverance, has been teaching from the Tridentine Council to the present Pontiff and which is condensed in the condemned proposition of the *Syllabus* that says: "*The Roman Pontiff can and must reconcile and compromise with progress, liberalism and modern civilization*".

If so radical is the incompatibility of the profound essence that agitates the entrails of the modern world with the nature of Catholicism, which is a humble subjection of the creature to the Will of the First Being, on what can Maritain base himself to affirm now that "*this dark path does not cease to have an exit*" and that the modern world "*aspires without knowing it to a civilization of the Christian type, outlined by St. Thomas?*"¹²⁶. Undoubtedly man, and the same is true of peoples, while they are in a state of pilgrimage they are cured, but they are cured not by remaining on the path where they have gone astray, but by turning from it, under the hand of divine mercy, and converting themselves to the One against whom they have sinned. *The peoples* - not the modern world - can be healed. But to do so *they must reject* those principles of absolute independence which constitute their principles of death. And what is it to renounce those principles if not to renounce the modern world itself? If the capital sin of the once Christian peoples is to have rejected Christian *public law*, which placed at the summit of all the values of civilization the intangible rights of God, of which the Holy Church is the depository, and to have erected in their place as the supreme norm of life the Rights of Man, what can be the beginning of their health but that they cast away from themselves that pride, embodied in what is called the modern world, and turn to Him who is their health, saying *Tibi soli peccavi. Against you alone have I sinned*. The peoples will then have achieved their exit; but they will have ceased to *be modern*. Does Maritain mean that this return to God will not entail for the peoples the renunciation of any authentic gain, but on the contrary, a consolidation of the true and legitimate conquests? Magnificent; this is the truth that the Holy Church has been tirelessly preaching to modern peoples. But let them not be deceived by the illusion that they will not burn the idols they adore. Let it not be suggested to them that their healing will be able to take place.

¹²⁵ *Antimoderne*, p. 198.

¹²⁶ *Réligion et Culture*, p. 41.

without a *profound return* to the substance of the values of culture and life that they have renounced.

This attempt to sublimate freedom and to pretend by *its way* to reach Christianity, will imply the perversion of the practical principles of true civilization and true Christianity. Regulatory principles that must not be lost sight of in the examination of the Maritainian errors. Here we must warn that if Maritain in his books subsequent to *Réligion et Culture*, particularly in his *Du régime* and *Humanisme Intégral*, limits himself to the work of a philosopher of culture, pointing out the direction of the currents that agitate modern peoples and, consequently, how the world of tomorrow must be, be it called Christianity, civilization, culture, democracy, fraternal city, we could point out nothing reprehensible in them, from the point of view of the Catholic doctrine, in which we place ourselves. Maritain could be right or wrong, but he would exercise a legitimate right. But it is known, with all certainty, that this is not his attitude. Maritain himself *expressly* affirms it when he presents his *concrete historical ideal* as "an objective apt to be fully and integrally *desired* (Maritain underlines), and to drag effectively towards itself, to finalize effectively the human energies, which will tend towards it, in a more lively way, as much as the will will will propose it in its integrity"¹²⁷ .

Maritain consciously assumes the role of *creator* of a new Christianity. For this reason, after having indicated the *normative* character of the concrete historical ideal, he points out that it is up to the philosopher and the man of action to fix, "what should be for the Christian, being a fact the age we are entering, this concrete historical ideal, this dynamic image of the future"¹²⁸ ; he intends, consequently, to elaborate "a politics, an economy, a sociology... which go down to the "practically practical" and determine what must be done at present for the temporal salvation of men: which translates, on the plan of action itself, into the fact, for those who intend to guide others, to be and to feel ready to exercise (supposing that circumstances permit) power immediately"¹²⁹ . And so that there can be no doubt, he emphasizes the decision of Lenin and Trostsky, before the October movement,

¹²⁷ *Du régime*, p. 131. [*M ed. fr. cites p. 133*].

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*

¹²⁹ *Ibid.* [*M ed. fr. also indicates: p. 133 and 134*].

adding: "Abstracting from the nature of the means employed, it is thus convenient for men of action to be ready, whether they are Catholics or Marxists. If they are afraid to win, then why lead the troops and ask them to fight?"¹³⁰ .

Consequently, Maritain, with his new Christianity, like Lamennais with his *L'Avenir* campaign, sets himself up as the leader of the temporary action of the "Christians", initiating a Revolution more revolutionary than the Revolution itself, as he points out in *Lettre sur l'indépendance*¹³¹ .

With this in mind, let the reader imagine how serious it is that this *Rule of Conduct* that Maritain erects for Christians, in their temporal activity -and what is there in the life of men that is not temporal?- departs from the *Rule of Conduct* proposed by the Magisterium of the Church to regulate the actions of Christians. Let us see then first of all what is the *Rule of Conduct* that is to finalize the actions of Christians.

Concept of civilization

Civilization comes from *civitas*, city, because the city offers conditions of perfection that man cannot find in solitude. It is precisely in the city that the efforts of all those who have found shelter there for the purpose of increasing the human values of life come together. The city is both an effect and a cause of perfection. Effect because it arises from the common concurrence of those who have attained and seek perfection; cause because it tends to provide it to the many who come to it in search of it.

There are those who consider the terms civilization and culture to be synonymous. But, although there are great connections between them, they cannot be considered identical. Culture, from *colere*, to cultivate, seems to indicate the activity of man applied to human nature so that it yields the fruits of which it is capable, just as it is said cultivation of the earth, to the effort of man to it.

¹³⁰ Ibid. [*M* ed. fr. also indicates: p. 134].

¹³¹ *Lettre sur l'Indépendance*, deux. ed., p. 65. [*The M ed. fr.* also indicates: Desclée de Brouwer].

applied. Culture connotes preferentially the perfection of the human personality, while civilization contemplates primarily that of society. We would say, then, that man seeks his culture in civilization, to mean that culture arises as a conquest of man's free and personal effort, achieved with the help of civilization, which has placed within his reach the means to attain it.

What is certain is that the concept of civilization has to be fixed in function of man. To measure its value only in attention to the degree of utilization of natural energies, as our Sarmiento who called barbarism everything that did not lead to this, is a gross aberration. If civilization only takes place among humans, if it is the fruit of their efforts and aims at their happiness, there is nothing more elementary than to try to fix its nature and limits according to the laws that regulate the improvement of man. To know what civilization is to be, we must first establish what man is like, and what he seeks in civilization. Not precisely what he seeks, *in fact*, many times, but what he seeks, *according to the very demands of his being*. *In fact*, he may deviate, but if even then, in the same deviations, we discover frustrated attempts of a deep and irrepressible yearning that moves him in search of his own good, of that good which, achieved, can give him peace and happiness, it will be that this good constitutes the goal and rule of his happiness. What, then, is this supreme good that man seeks in civilization, that he seeks when he approaches each and every particular good?

An elementary but accurate analysis immediately reveals that man, in the midst of the very diverse complexity of tendencies to which he is subjected, maintains a rigorous hierarchical unity. There are in him physical-chemical operations which are common to him with all the other bodies we see in nature; there are also vital operations of a purely vegetative nature, such as those of assimilation and growth, which are common to him with plants; there are also sensitive operations such as those we see in animals; and there are, finally, those which are proper and distinctive to him, such as those of understanding and willing. Notwithstanding the complexity of these activities and tendencies, man is a perfect unity.

One is, with unity of nature, although it is composed of two such incompatible principles as body and soul; one, with unity of person, because all his acts are attributed to the same "I" which perseveres, identical with himself, through the changing variations of life; one, with unity of orientation and destiny, because all that he does is directed toward a single and supreme goal, which is the search for Truth and the Good.

But the very complex unity of this spiritual substance which is man, a horizon in which spiritual and corporeal creatures are confined, presents us with the tremendous situation of a being who, although destined to a fullness of Truth and Good, finds himself in the greatest destitution. He is made, yes, for all Truth and Good and tends towards it with all the strength of his being, but he comes into the world in total deprivation of all Truth and all Good. In an arduous and progressive conquest he must first acquire purely material perfections, in order to attain, by means of these, those of his affective and sensitive life, and then also, through these, those of the intellective life, and finally culminate, already in the perfect age of his being, in the full contemplation of Truth.

If man, in total destitution of all perfection and with an irresistible yearning for it, seeks in civilization the means to provide it, civilization must bring together in itself - concretized in institutions, laws and customs - that most complex wealth of goods which man craves, arranged in that hierarchical unity according to which he craves them. Hence, it is so important to point out not only the need for these goods, without omitting any, but also the proportion and measure in which they should be supplied.

The scale of civilizing values according to St. Thomas

In the *Summa contra Gentiles*, St. Thomas has established with luminous precision the rule that measures the perfection of man. After explaining with copious and decisive reasons that human happiness does not consist in the delights of the body, nor in honors, nor in human glory, nor in riches or in power, nor in the health, beauty and vigor of the body, nor in sensible delights, nor even in the practice of moral virtues or in the

prudence or in the production of artistic or useful works, he ends by saying that "the supreme happiness of man lies in the contemplation of truth". And he adds these paragraphs that are worth a whole treatise on civilization. *"To this, then, (the contemplation of truth), all human operations seem to be ordered as to their end. For to perfect contemplation is required the incolumity of the body, to which are ordered all the productions of man necessary for his life. It also requires calmness from the disturbances of the passions, which is obtained by means of the moral virtues and prudence, and calmness from the exterior passions, to which the whole regime of civil life is ordered, so that if they are rightly considered, all human offices seem to be at the service of those who contemplate the truth"*¹³².

And as it immediately arises to the spirit, to what contemplated truth the Angelic Doctor here refers, he himself goes ahead to manifest it to us, saying: "It is not, however, possible that the ultimate happiness of man should consist in the contemplation which takes place in the intelligence of principles, which, as most universal, is most imperfect and contains only, in potency, the knowledge of things, and which is not the end but the beginning of human study, derived in us from nature and not from study; nor can it consist in the contemplation which takes place in the sciences, which deal with inferior things, when it is necessary that happiness should lie in the operation of the understanding with respect to the noblest intelligibles. *It only remains then that in the contemplation of the wisdom that deals with divine things consists the supreme happiness of man*"¹³³.

In this doctrine, so limpidly expounded by the Angelic Doctor, there is a lifting up of all the activities of man, which are directed toward the highest occupation of which he is capable, namely, the contemplation of the First Truth. To this divine occupation man is called by the efforts and cravings of his spiritual nature, which can only there satisfy his craving for the fullness of Truth. So long as he does not attain to it, he must necessarily feel himself wanting and unsatisfied and without true happiness.

It might perhaps be objected that this happiness here proposed by St. Thomas cannot be perfectly attained by any man in the p r e s e n t life; but

¹³² See chapters 25 to 63 of Book III.

¹³³ III, c. 37.

Even if this is so, it will always be true that the imperfect happiness of which he is capable in the present life can only be such insofar as it is conditioned by that rule of authentic perfection. For if in the present life there cannot be fullness of happiness it is precisely because man cannot perfectly fulfill in it the conditions of its acquisition, but never because one is the rule of happiness in this world and another, very different, in the other.

If this is so, if the same rule is valid for man's happiness in this life and in the next, it follows that in all his actions, even in those which by their nature may appear more remote, man must be guided by it alone. This rule constitutes in all truth a total ordering of man, and carries with it implicitly a complete conception of his life.

Man's whole life must rest as the first and fundamental truth - a truth that is not purely theoretical but practical, to be lived - in God, possessed in divine contemplation. All activities, be they economic, political, cultural or artistic, must be totally ordered toward God. God is the necessary goal of man. The supreme and only norm that regulates all the actions of his life. And the reader should note that we are speaking in a purely *natural* consideration, that is, attending only to the natural constituents of man that correspond to him by virtue of the demands of his pure nature; this contemplation of God, to which we are referring, is not the intuitive vision of the blessed who currently enjoy heaven, but it is a true contemplation, possession and fruition of God.

Let it also be noted that rejecting God as the supreme and total rule of man's life *necessarily* implies putting in his place another supreme rule of life, which will be either work, or pleasure, or money, or power, that is to say, a creature. Without a supreme and total rule, man's life, which is primarily a unity, cannot unfold. The alternative is irrefragable: either man serves God, submitting his whole life to him, or he serves things that are not God. Any other solution, any attempt at compromise, at accommodation, cannot be sustained, because to the extent that he does not submit himself to God, he is moving away from Him and, consequently, from his happiness. On the other hand

The latter implies establishing a rupture, a split in man who is a unity, placing in him two ultimate rules of life, two paths of progress, God in some things, creatures in others.

God constitutes then the principle of the essential perfection of man. Man does not perfect himself, he does not acquire any increase in his being, in the same human line, except when he progresses on this path of the possession of God. He may acquire *accidental* perfections when he departs from God; and thus man may, outside of Him, progress in techniques and in the human sciences, but then, in the purely *human line*, there will be no progress... on the contrary, it will happen that these *accidental* perfections, not ordered to the *essential* perfection of man, will dispose him to accelerate a process of deviation from God and, therefore, of regression. And it will then happen that, infatuated with his partial and accessory progress, man will fall deeper and deeper into the abyss of abjection. Those technical perfections, for example, legitimate in themselves and which, ordered as devices for the improvement of man's material well-being, could assure a moral improvement of the human community, and therefore a more rapid and easier ascent of a greater number in the knowledge of God, constituted instead as having value in themselves and for themselves, as an ultimate end, can only disrupt the whole of man's life, making it move in the opposite direction to that of its true perfection. This is why it is so fundamental to pay attention to this supreme rule of human perfection, which sets the scale of the true values of civilization.

This regulating principle establishes a hierarchy in all human activities, the value of which is to be measured by the degree of closeness to or preparation for it. For if the supreme end of man is the contemplation of God, it follows that the highest function of human life must correspond to the sage who is immersed in this divine occupation.

And behind the complete sage, all those who participate in him, who are those who contemplate the truth in its more imperfect degrees, proper to Philosophy and to the particular sciences such as mathematics, physical sciences; behind these must come those who put this truth into practice, already in their

The realized truth that constitutes the domain of *virtue* and, therefore, of the *politician*; and behind it must come the domain of the economic, that is, of the material requirements of existence subject to the conditions of *necessity*.

The nature of these domains, both in their internal condition and as a function of man, determines an inescapable hierarchical order. The economic or domain of necessity must submit to the regulations of virtue and virtue, in turn, to the demands of truth. The hierarchy - Truth - virtue - needs - corresponds to that of - wise - political - economic - and one and the other are founded on the very demands of being. Necessity cannot attain *human* status unless it receives the regulation of virtue, and virtue cannot be constituted as such unless it arises as an ordering of reason, and reason lacks a solid foundation unless it is affirmed by subsistent Truth.

Such is the conformation of man that he cannot perfect himself in his physical structure except by the incorporation of material goods, subject to needs, nor in his moral structure except by the fulfillment of the law, nor in his spiritual structure except by a total adaptation to God; such is his conformation that he needs all things for his perfection and that these same things push him irresistibly to seek in God the fullness of his perfection; such is his conformation that everything in him conspires to enable him to fulfill the highest operation of his being which is that of understanding in the highest act of this same operation which is that of understanding God, the highest and most sovereign intelligible; such is his conformation that it contains an ontological mystery because his happiness is necessarily made to the measure of God and not of man; that is, that the possession of God can only fulfill the innate desires of his intelligence made for Truth and of his will made for the Good.

The three value functions of a civilization

A civilization that deserves the name of such a civilization is constituted by the hierarchical subordination of the three values mentioned. The sage who considers the truth; the politician - king or government, whatever the regimes of his own secondary and accessory - who sets out to impose virtue; the

economic (merchant, craftsman, farmer) who takes care of the well-being of the body. Wisdom for the intelligence, virtue for the will, health for the body. Freedom where knowledge moves; strength that helps virtue; servitude or necessity that governs the provision of bodily goods. Culture that perfects the spirit; politics that governs the soul; economy that satisfies material needs. And the three symbols that enclose all that is human, that is, Knowledge, Power, and Wealth.

If man seeks his perfection in civilized life, and if this includes economic, virtuous and contemplative values, these three goods, progressively ordered, must be found in authentic civilization.

According to this scale of values it is clear that man is not *liberated* until he is provided with material resources, and is inwardly and outwardly tranquil, and enters into the contemplation of Truth. Culture, humanism, which does not deserve the name of such if it does not culminate in the possession of the Sovereign Good, is above politics, necessarily presupposes it and directs it as contemplation directs and governs action. Politics for its part presupposes the economy and also directs it as ethics regulates the mechanical and instinctive forces of man.

In this hierarchical subordination lies the health of these values and of all civilization. If Culture breaks the bond that unites it with God, the First Truth, it becomes an end in itself, and is *profaned*, bringing rebellion and anarchy to the domain of Knowledge. Without the First Intelligible, all understanding becomes unintelligible. Civilization is then surrendered to the pure force of Power. Political power loses its *instrumental* reason and becomes an end in itself. And as erected in absolute value, political power, whose essence is to serve, cannot be maintained, it is necessarily supplanted by the inferior forces of the economic, and society, prey to materialism, walks towards disintegration.

It is a necessary condition for a civilization to maintain itself in its own being that, through all its vital relations and structures, a force of unity should unite in the contemplation of Truth all the very diverse complexity of human operations and functions. If Truth fails to maintain the center of unity in the social whole, it will soon constitute another

principle of unity, which will be Power or Money, Pleasure or Work. But this society, decentered from its true end, will be at the mercy of profound rebellions that will end up fragmenting and dissolving it in an endless process of anarchy and tyranny.

In this process of disintegration one *norm of social coexistence* - the contemplation of the divine Truth - will be replaced by another *essentially* different one - Power, Money, Labor - and society, if one wishes civilization, in a less rigorous use of the term, one might say abusive, will *essentially* change insofar as it ceases to conform to the essential conditions of its own being: the new civilization will *necessarily* be perverse. We could also point out here that a society placed under the sign of Money, like the mercantile society of England-United States, or under the sign of Labor like the communist society of Russia, will necessarily be *atheistic*, because even if the merchant and the worker can believe in God, they will believe in Him neither as merchant nor as worker, but because they are men, that is, because they are much more than merchant and worker. Therefore, a society that erects Money or Labor as the supreme value of life, is necessarily atheistic, as a city.

If man had therefore been created in the state that theologians call pure nature, civilization would unite in itself, hierarchically subordinate, bodily goods, political goods, and cultural and religious goods. Political power, although it would be at the apex of all human values, as the expression of the human community, and as the culmination of all institutions and societies called to procure the goods of body, soul and spirit, would be subordinated to the laws of reason, and, above all, to God the First Truth and First Good, whose rights would constitute the foundation of all other rights and obligations. Everything would start from God and everything would lead to God because civilization, destined to perfect man, would only induce him to place himself in connection with the very source of all Truth and all Good.

In that Society, the Philosopher -not the pseudo-philosopher and much less the journalist- would reign above all, who, now perfected and liberated, would communicate especially to the Politician, to the Prudent, the practical conclusions,

The latter, in turn, with the discipline of the laws, would raise the popular multitude, as far as possible, to participate in the contemplative life of the philosopher.

But man, in the present condition in which he has been created, cannot by the forces of his nature alone achieve this state of perfection demanded by a human civilization. Man cannot be truly *man* left to his own will alone. And if it is true that God could have assured him the functioning of his human condition by a gratuitous concession of extraordinary, purely natural gifts, it is also true that he did not grant him such gifts except by *raising him* to an infinitely superior condition in which he was constituted a participant in the same divine nature. The state in which he was created, called *original justice*, guaranteed him full human integrity and divine elevation.

In this state man could, by virtue of gratuitous aids which perfected his nature, easily and fully fulfill his natural end which is the *human* contemplation of the Divine Truth, and he could also by virtue of strictly supernatural gifts enter into the same Divine society and have access to the *divine* contemplation of the Divine Truth.

Original righteousness was a free, *elevating* gift bestowed by God as "an accident of the specific nature which, though not caused by the principles of the species, was gratuitously united to it"¹³⁴. A gift that was to be propagated in the act of generation to all the descendants of the first man together with the communication of the human species; but when Adam lost it with his prevarication, he communicated to his descendants a nature destitute of the original justice in which it was created and therefore a fallen nature and *affected with guilt*, inasmuch as *deprived* of a gift that by divine institution corresponds to it. Since then man is born without supernatural elevation and without human integrity. He is neither divine nor fully human. Man is born sick and wounded in his nature.

¹³⁴ I. II. 81. 2.

Disease state of present-day man

St. Thomas clearly exposes which are the open wounds in the flanks of the existential and concrete man, as he comes to this world.

By original justice," says St. Thomas, "reason perfectly contained the lower powers of the soul; and reason itself, subject to God, was perfected by Him. But original justice was lost by the sin of the first Father, as has already been said (q. LXXXI, a. 2.). And for this reason all the powers of the soul remain in a certain sense destitute of their proper order, which naturally conforms them to virtue; and this destitution is called wounds of nature. There are four powers of the soul in which the virtues can reside as in subjects, as is said above (q. LXXIV); namely, reason where prudence resides; the will in which justice is seated; the irascible where fortitude resides; the concupiscible where temperance is subject; reason destitute of its proper order to truth, is wounded with ignorance; the will without order to the good, is wounded with malice; the irascible without order to the arduous is wounded with weakness; and concupiscence destitute of the order to the delightful moderated by reason, is wounded with concupiscence. Thus these are the four wounds inflicted on the whole human nature as a consequence of the sin of the First Father"¹³⁵ .

Consequently man, left to his own devices, tends to decline into error and evil¹³⁶ . The moral impotence of man to know in a convenient and complete way the truths that command him even with respect to his natural end was highlighted by the first Christian apologists such as Tertullian, Lactantius and Justin against the pagans, whom St. Paul already accused of "boasting that they were wise while they were dumb".

But the Vatican Council has expressly defined that it is to be attributed to divine revelation that men may know easily and with firm certainty, without any mixture of error, even those truths which are not inaccessible to human reason and which are necessary for the orderly ordering of the world, and that it is necessary for the orderly ordering of the world.

¹³⁵ I. II. 85, 3.

¹³⁶ Rom., I, 22.

man both with respect to his ultimate end and to human coexistence with other men.

But if man's impotence is great in regard to his intelligence, it is greater in regard to his will, because of what the poet said: *Video melioro proboque deteriora sequor*. There is no doubt - and this is the truth of faith against Luther, Calvin and the Jansenists - that nature after sin has not been totally corrupted and has not lost the power to accomplish many good works; but in such a way it has been weakened that it cannot accomplish "*totum bonum sibi connaturale*", all the good that is connatural to it, without often failing. Like a sick person," teaches St. Thomas¹³⁷, "who by himself can have some movement, but cannot move *perfectly*, with the movement of a healthy man, if he is not healed with the help of medicine". This truth of Catholic theology does not hesitate to consider it even as a dogma of faith authorized theologians, such as Billot, because its denial constituted the very substance of the Pelagian heresy.

St. Paul, whose word is authentically divine and to which, consequently, assent of faith is due, establishes this truth in his famous Letter to the Romans¹³⁸. There he first enumerates the abominable crimes of the heathen and then reproaches the Jews who, setting themselves up as judges of the heathen, committed the very abominations they condemned. He then adduces the cause of this universal corruption, and brings in the prevarication of Adam, by which he entered and subjected all men to his empire. He shows how the reign of sin took hold and took root after the fall, so that not even the law given to the Jews has served as a sufficient aid against its pernicious tyranny, but rather as an occasional cause of greater crime. Finally, he describes the struggle of the interior man, seeing the best and approving it, but following the worst, because although he recognizes and accepts the law, he follows the concupiscence of the flesh against the judgment of the mind. Finally, he draws as a conclusion from all this that there is no other means of escape from this miserable slavery but the grace of the Redeemer. *oh, what a*

¹³⁷ I. II. 109. 2.

¹³⁸ VII, 24.

Who will deliver me from this body of death? Only the grace of God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Hence, without the help of grace, every man - Jew and pagan - becomes foolish, unbelieving, misguided, a slave of his evil desires and base passions, full of malice and envy, hateful and hating one another¹³⁹. For this reason the Fathers of the Council of Miletus defined against the Pelagians that without grace the divine commands cannot be fulfilled. And famous is the letter addressed to this Council of Miletus by Pope Innocent I where he writes: "When the Pelagians deny the help of God, they say that man is self-sufficient and that he does not need grace; but, deprived of grace and pretending to fulfill the commandments of life with freedom alone, he must necessarily succumb to the devil's nets. Oh perverse doctrine of perverse minds! When it is known that freedom so deceived the first man that, by indulgently loosening his restraints, he fell by presumption into prevarication, and from this he could not have been extricated if, by the providence of regeneration, the advent of Jesus Christ had not reformed the state of the former freedom."

In other words, man cannot, in the state in which he is presently born, fulfill the law of nature. If he were to be able to fulfill it by his own strength alone, he would have to *assert himself* in the love of the end to which the law of nature commands him, or indeed in the love of the reward or the fear of the penalty with which that end is sanctioned. For there is no other way to overcome the difficulties and discomforts that oppose the end than the love of the end itself or of the goods that conversion to it brings or that its deviation deprives one of. Thus it is that in the miserable condition of fallen nature man cannot by his own strength raise his mind to the point of placing and establishing it effectively on the ultimate end of the divine law and on the goods connected with the future life. But more than this, he cannot even be effectually affected by the intermediate end, which is the honesty of the present life, so that the love of such honesty constantly prevails in him, because he is hindered by the strong influence exerted upon him by the attraction of the delightful or useful good which frequently presents itself to him, because of the

¹³⁹ Titus, III, 3.

The pressing movements of concupiscence, the temptations of the devil, the scandals, the worldly favor certainly granted to those who live according to the world and refused to those who do not want to conform to it. If, therefore, the firm affection of the end and the sanction of the law is a necessary condition to be able to observe the precepts, it must be concluded that man in his present condition is entirely incapable of fulfilling them completely, since the precepts that look immediately to God, the rewarder of the future life, cannot sufficiently affirm him while, on the contrary, adultery, fornication, robbery, hatreds, and false testimonies dominate him in a very serious way that he will hardly be able to overcome¹⁴⁰.

Civilization, then, which is nothing but the perfection of man on the *social* plane of his existence while he is living in the present life, although it is developed here below, cannot be achieved without supranatural help. Man cannot live together without hatred, if before, lights and medicinal forces are not granted to him to cure his state of illness. Pius XII did but recall this truth when in May 1945 he wrote: "But first it is necessary to ask God that the minds and hearts of men may be enlightened and renewed in the light of the teachings of Christian doctrine, which alone can bring about individual and public salvation, so that this devastating war of peoples and continents may end and so that citizens of all classes, united by bonds of friendship, may begin the reconstruction of the human edifice on the immense pile of ruins, in the shadow of the banner of justice and charity".

The Church, the great means of health

If God has willed to give any remedy to this state of sickness in which man comes, and what that remedy is, we could not know it if He Himself had not willed to reveal it. *"God who once spoke to our fathers at different times and in many ways by the prophets, has spoken to us in our days by his Son, whom he has appointed universal heir of all things, through whom he created the ages."*

¹⁴⁰ Billot, *De gratia*, p. 61.

¹⁴¹ St. Paul, Hebrews, I, 1.

Now, Jesus Christ left us a universal means of health to reach the Truth and the Good: it is the Catholic Church. The Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, which have perfect historical value, being able to defy the most demanding criticism, show us how Jesus Christ, founded a religious society, whose preparation had begun John the Baptist, on the banks of the Jordan, when he cried out: "Do penance because the kingdom of God is at hand"; and the same Jesus, imprisoned John, withdrew from Galilee.... And from then on he began to preach and to say: "Do penance because the kingdom of heaven is at hand"¹⁴² ; this kingdom that he prepared and arranged before his passion by gathering the apostles and disciples, giving them mission and establishing their organization, he continued it after his passion when he confirmed Peter the primacy and when he ordered the whole Apostolic College: "Go and preach to all the nations.... teaching them to observe all things that I have commanded you, and be sure that I will be with you to the end of the age"¹⁴³ .

This society, thus founded, with its doctrine, its organization, its authorities, with the promise of assistance and indefectibility, began to function under the government of Peter and the Apostles, as a society distinct from the synagogue in "Jerusalem, and all Judea, and Samaria, unto the uttermost part of the earth"¹⁴⁴ : as a religious society, visible as a city placed on a mountain which cannot be hidden and which is seen by all who come from the Austro and the Aquilon from the East and the West, because it is for all a necessary means of health. Thus the Councils have defined it, the Fifth Lateran, which says *extra illam nullus omnino salvetur*, outside of it no one can be saved, and the Florentine, which says that "not only pagans, but neither Jews nor heretics and schismatics can be partakers of eternal life". The reason is clear and was given in definite form by the Apostles, Peter and John, when after having cured the lame man who was begging alms at the door of the temple, they said to the people: "We declare to all of you and to all the people of Israel that the healing has been done in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ the Nazarene, whom you crucified and God has raised up. By virtue of that name this man is made whole in our eyes. This Jesus is that stone which you rejected, which has become the chief cornerstone. Apart from Him we must not look for salvation in

¹⁴² Mt., II, 13-17.

¹⁴³ Mt., XXVIII, 18

¹⁴⁴ Acts, I, 8.

no other. For no other Name under heaven has been given to men by which we must be saved". For this reason the ancient Fathers have compared the Church to Noah's Ark. "Whoever," says St. Cyprian, "separated from this Church is joined to an adulteress, is also separated from the Promises made to this Church. He is a stranger, he is profane, he is an enemy. Just as none of those who were outside the Ark could escape, so none of those who were outside the Church can escape". Neither individuals, nor peoples, nor humanity itself, can achieve their health except in the Church. She is the supreme of all that exists on earth.

Civilization, whose *raison d'être*, as we have seen, is to be the means of perfecting man, cannot fulfill its mission unless *it is united to the Church* and receives from her the ordering to the end and the means that lead to it. And just as in the purely natural order all economic and political means were ordered to the contemplative orbit where man found his salvation, so when God sets man a *new* and higher end, a new and more excellent contemplative orbit, the whole order of political and economic means, which had the reason of being a means to that end, are consequently varied, not by an intrinsic mutation of nature, but by an extrinsic mutation of relationships. The object of politics, which *is temporal happiness founded on public peace and the maintenance of justice among citizens*, is now conditioned and dependent not on *natural* eternal happiness but on *supernatural* eternal happiness.

Let us then see how the relationship between the profane and the sacred is established in the *new civilization*.

The two jurisdictions of the profane and the sacred

The Church is an essentially religious, sacred and supernatural society: Is there not an incompatibility between these characteristics and the visible and organizational character of the Church? It is clear that the supernatural is always related to the divine nature, to the Deity himself, and that as such it cannot be visible, it does not admit of organization. But visible elements, even corruptible ones, can be used by God as vehicles of the supernatural.

supernatural. This is the unspeakable mystery of the Church. Her life, properly speaking, consists in effective union with the most intimate of God. From there comes the Church - from the bosom of God - and there she leads. From there comes her doctrine, her grace, her government to descend to the earthly world in which men live, not to remain there but to lead them to the eternal life from which she proceeds. Men, then, doctrine, sacraments, hierarchy and ecclesiastical government, which have arisen through the reception of supernatural gifts, are visible elements that participate in the invisible supernatural. Therefore, what measures the supernatural condition of the Church is not properly speaking the nature of the elements that can integrate or serve her, but the purpose of all that she is and does. What is the Church for? To lead men to eternal life. Therefore, Christians, the ecclesiastical government and all that is in some way linked to it - as such - have as their end, to which they are ordered, in their own right and directly, eternal life. All this, although it is on earth and arises from the earth, belongs to the supernatural, or sacred or ecclesiastical order. Temples and properties, institutions, doctrine, sacraments, legislation and government of the Church and the individuals who participate in them fall within this supernatural or sacred sphere.

Civilization, on the other hand, does not have as its proper and peculiar end to lead man to eternal life; its end is to assure him a prosperous and happy human coexistence during the days that this pilgrimage lasts. Therefore, it properly includes everything that is directly and directly the means for this prosperity. The psalmist describes to us¹⁴⁵ these goods: "...Whose children are like new plants in the flower of their age: whose daughters are compounded and decked on every side, as the idols of a temple; whose storehouses are full, and their fruits overflowing; whose flocks are fruitful, and go forth to feed in many herds; whose herds are fat and plump; whose cows are not seen in their walls, neither are gates and ruins; nor cries of weeping heard in their squares. Happy shall they call the people who enjoy these things". It is clear that none of this is ordered by its nature to eternal life; nor are human techniques and arts, economics and politics ordered to it. What good is it for the happiness of heaven, to have healthy sons, beautiful daughters, full larders, plenty of cattle, no disturbance, no riot, no shouting in the squares, but quietness, peace and abundance in the houses and in the cities? Certainly, all these goods are not

¹⁴⁵ Psalm 143:12-15.

They are not ordered, either directly or by themselves, to the happiness of eternal life; and it is certain, most certain, that without them, and with sick sons and ugly daughters, and scarcity and hardship, and with war, pestilence and famine, men can reach eternal life.

Eternal happiness has then another series of means that, of themselves, lead to it, as another is the series of those that of themselves lead to temporal or profane happiness. What is then the criterion to distinguish one and the other series of means, one and the other plane? Certainly not the intrinsic nature of one or the other. For in the temporal order there are spiritual elements such as politics itself and the pure sciences and the exercise of the virtues and the production of the fine arts, and in the supernatural order there are material elements such as temples and the sustenance of the ministers of worship. Therefore, only the end to which, by their nature, they are directly ordered, is the criterion for discerning the place that corresponds to them.

The important thing is to affirm the existence of two kinds, in a certain way irreducible, of activities in which the life of man unfolds, the one that we call civilization and ends here below, and the other that we call the Church or kingdom of God and that, begun here below, has no end. Hugo of St. Victor expressed this doctrine in definitive form: "Two are the lives, one earthly, the other celestial; one corporeal, the other spiritual; one [by which the body of the soul lives, the other.... (omitted. in the editions, n. d. e.)] by which the soul of God lives. One and the other have their own good, by which they are fed and nourished in order to subsist. The earthly life is nourished by earthly goods; the spiritual life by spiritual goods. To the earthly life belong all earthly goods, to the spiritual life all spiritual goods. Two powers are constituted so that in both the one and the other justice may be guarded and usefulness assured.... In the laity, to whose care and providence belong the things necessary for earthly life, is the earthly power. In the clerics, on the other hand, to whose care belong the goods of the spiritual life, the power is divine. The former power is called secular and the latter spiritual. Each of these powers is supreme and definitive in its own order. And just as the civil power cannot make its own causes that have failed by the ecclesiastical power, so neither can the ecclesiastical power, even the full power of the Roman Pontiff, intervene directly and by reason of the temporal, in temporal affairs. And if anyone has, for example, a lawsuit in questions of property in which

the civil power does not make it

The corresponding justice may not have recourse to the ecclesiastical power, which has no direct jurisdiction in temporal matters.

The unity of man and the two jurisdictions

It was the Church that clearly taught the double and irreducible jurisdiction in which man's life unfolds. This is the reason for her energetic reaction against paganism, which erected emperors as Pontiffs. But distinction cannot mean independence and separation, as liberalism has endeavored to do, renewing in this, as Boniface VIII warned the first liberals, the legists of the fourteenth century, the error of the Manichaeans.

The unity of God, exemplary of the unity of man, demands that there be an essential subordination of one order to the other; and since the subordination of the superior to the inferior, of the Church to the temporal, cannot be admitted, as the most absolute and consistent liberals claim, there remains only the subordination of civil jurisdiction to ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

The demonstration is simple and is based on the unity of man, who is a single whole and who has a single and ultimate end, to which he must order all his actions. This end, the sole and absolute end of his whole life, is God, the uncreated Good to whom he must attend and love with all his heart, with all his mind, with all his soul and with all his strength, in such a way that each and every act of his life, of whatever matter and nature it may be, must be a *direct means* that leads us to eternal life, for which we have been created. Here we can no longer make the distinction that we formulated before when we considered the nature of human activities and said that some were direct temporal means and others direct supernatural means that lead to eternal life. And so, even when in a builder, his professional activity is ordered to build a thing, his professional activity is ordered to build a thing.

-finis operis- that activity in him must have as its ultimate end *-finis operantis-* to achieve eternal life. The activity of building the house must be ordered to that end. The farmer, artisan, merchant, politician, subject and prince, people and government, layman and cleric, must all be ordered to that end.

the actions of his life -private and public- as *direct means* to gain eternal life.

God, the author of graces," teaches the eminent theologian Garrigou-Lagrange, "asks, in fact, that all our voluntary acts be at least virtually ordered to him: in other words, they must all contribute to our moral and spiritual progress, to our sanctification and salvation. This is true not only of the specifically religious act, such as prayer, but of all our voluntary and free acts, whatever they may be, even indifferent ones, by reason of their object. Each one must have a good moral end, subordinated to the ultimate end which is God, loved above all else, more than ourselves, more than our family and our country." "*Whatever you do,*" says St. Paul, "*do it for the greater glory of God*" (I. Cor. X, 31)¹⁴⁶ .

If this is so, if with all that we are and have, we must aspire and tend toward eternal life, transforming all our temporal activity into supernatural acts, then it follows that civilization, that the human temporal order, must in some way be subordinated to the Kingdom of God, that is, to the Church, under whose jurisdiction all that is supernatural falls. And since it cannot be subordinated directly, that is, by reason of the nature of the activity - *ratione operis* - since it is not a means directly conducive to eternal life, it must therefore be subordinated indirectly, *ratione operantis*, by reason of the person who makes use of it.

The temporal human life, civilization, must be such that it does not put obstacles in the way of eternal life, on the contrary, it serves as a positive aid to it.

Here we see how absurd and outside Catholic orthodoxy is every attempt to limit an area of human activity that can be truly "profane" or "lay," without a "sacred" character, absolutely subtracted from "clerical" jurisdiction. Only by abstracting activities from man can these be considered as *purely* temporal; but what activity can there be in man that is not human? And if it is human,

¹⁴⁶ *La Vie Spirituelle*, March 1927.

how can it cease to be supernatural? And if it is supernatural, how can cease to fall under the jurisdiction of the Holy Church?

*The jurisdiction of the Church as an indirect power over all things
temporary*

Hence it is the unanimous doctrine of theologians that it cannot be denied without danger of heresy, as Cardinal Bellarmine says, that Jesus Christ, in granting to St. Peter and his successors the fullness of spiritual power, also granted them a jurisdiction that extends to all the means, even indirect, that lead to this end. For this reason, the evangelical law, *I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, feed my lambs, feed my sheep*, has *positively* instituted in Christian societies the subordination of civil authority to religious authority.

Suarez further develops this doctrine by showing that this subordination is demanded, both on the part of the Christian prince and on the part of the subjects. On the part of the prince, because as a Christian he is subject to Peter, who was given jurisdiction over all the acts of the subjects, by which he can lose or gain eternal life; and one of these acts is the proper use of the power of government; then to the spiritual shepherd of such a prince belongs the power to direct him in the use of this temporal power, insofar as it may harm or profit his soul, as Pope Gelasius I, epis. 8, to the emperor Anastasius: "Two are, Augustus emperor, the powers that govern this world: the sacred authority of the Pontiffs and the royal power. In which the responsibility of the priests is all the greater inasmuch as they *have to give an account before God*, in the divine tribunal *of the kings themselves*". But also, on the part of the subjects, there are more serious reasons. For by virtue of the office entrusted to him by Christ, the Pontiff must have the spiritual care of the whole Christian people and remove from them the spiritual obstacles which may arise from the abuse of temporal power. Therefore also, by this title, it is necessary that the spiritual power be indirectly extended to

temporal things, directing the political power where it is convenient so that it does not order the temporal in such a way that it harms the spiritual.

This doctrine is so serious that Popes Innocent XI, Alexander VIII and Pius VI have condemned the first article of the Gallican Declaration of 1682, which said: *"Kings and princes are not subject - directly or indirectly - by divine disposition, to any ecclesiastical power"....* Doctrine that has been unknown by the liberal Catholics of the last century, who, not being able to contradict the unanimity of theologians who have sustained it, and not daring to accuse of abuse of authority the holy and wise Pontiffs of the Middle Ages, who, by virtue of it, intervened many times in political matters, have tried to justify such interventions, not to justify them, they gave to justify these interventions, not by virtue of the apostolic authority of the Pontiff, but by virtue of public law, then in force in Europe, or *by reason of an express or tacit consent of the Christian peoples* who would have instituted the Roman Pontiff supreme author of political things. But this is completely false. For in practicing these interventions, the Pontiffs have not invoked an alleged purely historical right but their Supreme and Apostolic spiritual Authority. And the dogmatic definition of Boniface VIII in the *Unam Sanctam*, whose doctrine, because of its dogmatic character is valid today, as it was yesterday, and as it will be tomorrow, when it will be totally violated by the earthly power of the Antichrist, we should keep it in mind in order to see in all its projection how far the intervention of the Church on civilization goes.

"The word of the Gospel instructs us that in this power there are two swords, the spiritual and the temporal.... Both swords, then, the spiritual and the material, are in the power of the Church. But the latter is used for the Church. The former by the Church. The former is in the hand of the priest, the latter in the hand of kings or soldiers, but at the orders and under the permission of the priest. It is necessary that one sword be under the other, and that the temporal authority submits to the spiritual power..."

Diverse Christianities

Maritain admits all this doctrine and has admirably and courageously expounded it, especially in his *Primauté du Spirituel*. But his purpose

The more or less openly confessed fundamental desire to reconcile the modern world with Christian civilization must induce him to alter, in spite of himself, this notion of Christian civilization.

In his *Du Régime Temporel*, Maritain undertakes, for the first time, the study of his "new Christianity" whose characters he had hinted at in *Réligion et Culture*. Aware of the difficulties and dangers of the task, he begins by warning that he does not renounce the traditional principles of Catholic theology, on the subordination of the temporal to the spiritual that he had so forcefully expounded in his *Primauté du Spirituel*. "Those who have looked upon - says¹⁴⁷ - *Primauté du Spirituel* as an "itinerary of escape" have grossly deceived themselves. This book was intended to obtain from some a *purification* of reason and faith, which would first of all concentrate the latter on the only thing necessary, but which by abundance would make them more apt to impose on matter, when the time came, the primacy which it asserted."

Maritain, consequently, according to what emerges from his explicit statements, continues to uphold all the traditional doctrine of Catholic theology that he so bravely exposed in his *Primauté du Spirituel*. Doctrine, which is nothing but ecclesiastical public law and which is immutable. It has been able to present itself," writes Maritain¹⁴⁸, "under different aspects, but in its essentials it has not changed over the centuries. What in the Middle Ages was called the doctrine of the two swords - at least in the sense of St. Bernard and St. Thomas Aquinas, as in that of the pontifical documents - is essentially identified with what has been called, since Bellarmine and Suarez, the doctrine of indirect power - at least if this is understood without diminution. To anyone who looks closely enough, behind the historical vicissitudes, the substance of things, a single and unique teaching is dispensed by Boniface VIII in the bull *Unam Sanctam* and by Leo XIII in the encyclical *Immortale Dei*; and to have a complete idea of indirect power it is necessary to keep in mind at the same time these two great documents".

If this is so, the reader will immediately think, there can be but one Christianity, at least as far as its *specific essence* is concerned. He does not believe

¹⁴⁷ *Du régime temporel*, p. 129. [*L a M* ed. fr. cit. p. 131].

¹⁴⁸ *Primauté du Spirituel*, p. 28.

Thus Maritain. "The word "Christianity", says¹⁴⁹ , refers to the order of culture. It designates a certain common temporal regime of the peoples educated by the Church. There is but one church; there can be Christian civilizations, diverse "Christendoms".

And the whole effort undertaken by Maritain from his *Réligion et Culture, Du Régime Temporel, Humanisme Intégral* to his most recent publications such as *Principes d'une politique humaniste* and *de Bergson à Saint Thomas*, will have to consist in exposing the characters of the new Christianity, of which Saint Thomas would be the architect as Saint Augustine was the architect of the medieval¹⁵⁰ .

But how to admit a single doctrine with essentially diverse applications? Maritain tries to justify it by resorting to a new application of the distinction so common in the modern politico-religious vocabulary of "thesis" and "hypothesis". "There is - says¹⁵¹ - no more common distinction, in the modern political-religious vocabulary, than that of the "thesis" and the "hypothesis". One often finds under these words very confused ideas in which the errors pointed out above are simply juxtaposed, as if the one compensated for the other.

"In the affirmation of the "thesis" a free field is given to the most elementary univocity while with the "hypothesis" a complete equivocity takes the revenge. The thesis becomes all the more majestic when a secret awareness of its ineffectiveness, and a secret desire that it always remain theoretical, subtract it from the proof of existence. The hypothesis is so much more abandoned to all the facilities of opportunism and liberalism as the new state of the world, of which one has only an empirical consciousness, seems more distant from a timelessness confused with the past as past. Below a speculative starry firmament action is thus left, in the properly practical order, almost unprincipled".

Maritain's criticism reaches, there is no doubt, to false and dangerous approaches typical of liberal Catholicism since the time of Lamennais.

¹⁴⁹ *Du régime*, p. 114. [*L a Med. fr. cit.* p. 116].

¹⁵⁰ *From Bergson to Saint Thomas*, p. 269.

¹⁵¹ *Du régime temporel*, p. 129. [*The M ed. fr. cit.* p. 131].

But he is not content with this criticism but adds: "To this misunderstood notion of thesis and hypothesis it is necessary to oppose, we believe, another conception, in which there is not a "thesis" installed in a world separated from existence, but what we have called a *concrete historical*, or practical *ideal*, an image incarnating for a given historical heaven and under a form essentially appropriate to it the supra-historical truths, which will then be distinguished, not from a "hypothesis" given to opportunism, but from the *conditions of effective realization* of this practical ideal. This ideal is realizable, more or less with difficulty, perhaps with extreme difficulties, but there is a difference in nature between difficulty and impossibility. In fact, it will encounter obstacles, it will be realized more or less badly, the result obtained may be weak, if you will, null: the essential thing is that there is an objective capable of being *desired* (Maritain underlines) fully and integrally, and of effectively dragging human energies, which will tend towards it in a more lively way the more the will will will propose it in its integrality".

What judgment should we make of Maritain's attempt? Let us dispense with the confusion that at first sight involves this attempt because if so great has been the confusion, as Maritain maintains, aroused before around the "thesis" and the "hypothesis", greater must be now that there are many "theses" -as many as there are historical heavens- and consequently many more "hypotheses". But this is not the seriousness of the matter. What is serious, very serious, is that Maritain's attempt contains the substantial error of theological liberalism, namely that the doctrine of the Church which we have exposed and which is still known in Pontifical Documents as the *Immortale Dei* of Leo XIII, under the name of *concord of the priesthood and the empire* is a *purely speculative doctrine*, and that it is not capable of being proposed as an *end* to the will of the Christian. But this is a most serious error, a *theological error*, which contradicts all the teachings of the Church. So then the Bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII and the *Immortale Dei* of Leo XIII, and the teachings^M of theologians on the subordination of the State to the Church and the doctrines of canonists on ecclesiastical public law are not difficult but *impossible to achieve*, and do not propose an *objective* capable of being fully and completely desired and do not present an end capable of effectively dragging human energies?

Garrigou-Lagrange¹⁵² : "In truth, the *thesis* [traditional Catholic doctrine] cannot be considered as a merely speculative ideal to be abandoned in practice, *because this thesis enunciates the very end to be attained*, namely that true religion is to be embraced by men not only individually but also socially. For the attainment of this end, circumstances must be considered; therefore, in some cases, that is, *per accidens*, prudence dictates that *some evil must be tolerated* in order to avoid a greater evil. But to abandon the thesis as something purely ideal, to be kept only in schools of theology, *would be to depart from the very end to be achieved*. This would be to fall into opportunism and to depart more and more from the love of God and of souls; moreover, the thesis, which enunciates a very grave obligation, would be considered as an empty word and as if it were nothing.

"Thus by the abuse of this distinction between *thesis* and *hypothesis*, as if *the thesis were merely speculative* and the hypothesis the only practical rule, Catholic social action would gradually be destroyed; already many Catholics seem to ignore the obligations of society towards God and consider as legitimate the neutrality of the State, the neutrality of the school, complete freedom of conscience. In this way society becomes radically irreligious and atheistic.

"Hence, because of this abuse, many theologians substitute the distinction between the "thesis" and the "hypothesis" for that of the "*end*" and the "*means*" which here and now are opportune for this end, according to the judgment of prudence. This is the only way to keep what above all must be kept, namely the *effective intention of the end*, from which proceeds the rectitude and efficacy of the choice and of the means to the end. Moreover, in this way the authority of God and the freedom of men are at the same time kept in proper harmony, inasmuch as the latter differs from license, which ends in the slavery of corruption".

For this reason Father Liberatore, reacting energetically against this claim of liberal Catholicism now renewed by Maritain, says: "But, And aren't these truths practical, that is, intended to direct the

¹⁵² *De Revelatione*, p. 628. [*L to M*, 1st. ed. - 1945- and fr. ed. indicate: 2nd. ed.]

actions? And a truth ordered to direct actions, can it without consequence be admitted and willed that it does not in fact apply to directing them?"¹⁵³ .

But Maritain insinuates: how can an ideal that is not difficult but "impossible" to realize be the end of my actions?¹⁵⁴ . This difficulty has an easy answer: how can it be *impossible* what has been a *fact* until the impious French Revolution? Unless it is to be called *impossible* inasmuch as it cannot be realized with all the integrity and purity of the principles. But "with the same arguments," answers the great theologian Billot, "it could be demonstrated that the precepts of virtue must be left to the field of speculation because the human condition does not suffer from so much loftiness of rectitude. It could also be demonstrated that the mathematical sciences cannot or should not have any application to the arts, because that ideal, exact, geometrical triangle is not realized concretely or because the experimental effect contradicts the rigor of the calculus"¹⁵⁵ . But this *impossibility* would also exist - and it would not be lesser- for the *concrete historical ideal* invented by Maritain that could never obtain in the concrete realization *the perfection* with which it has been imagined in the idea.

But if Maritain wanted to base the impossibility on the fact that modern societies are so deeply worked by impiety that they cannot stand that Catholic doctrine of the *concord of the priesthood and the empire* and, consequently, pretend to propose a *more tolerable* doctrine to them, it would be like someone who pretends to relax the Catholic doctrine on adultery so that adulterers could agree to new moral norms that are more *feasible*.

It is not the notion of *Christianity* that must change, but the pride and ignorance of the peoples that must give way to the *integral Catholic Truth that saves*. Maritain, in his *Clairvoyance de Rome*, defended it with energy when he recalled those most wise words of Benedict XV: "*In the midst of the present upheavals, it is important to repeat to men that the Church is, by divine institution, the only Ark of Health for humanity.... It is more opportune than ever to teach that the liberating truth for individuals as well as for societies is supernatural truth in all its fullness and purity without attenuation and without diminution, and without compromise, such in a*

¹⁵³ *La Iglesia y el Estado*, Madrid, 1878, p. 23.

¹⁵⁴ *Du régime*, p. 131. [*L a Med. fr. cit. p. 133*].

¹⁵⁵ *De Ecclesia*, II, 55.

*word as Our Lord Jesus Christ came to bring it into the world just as its custody and teaching has been entrusted to Peter and the Church"*¹⁵⁶ .

But it will be said: Maritain does not deny the validity of these principles but their *immediate* practicality. And he maintains that they must be replaced by ideals that concretize them, according to the historical climate of each age. But this is an incredible aberration. Because those *determined and concrete conditions*, in which the *concrete historical ideal* forged by Maritain verifies "*the supra-historical truths*" ,¹⁵⁷

Are these conditions unacceptable or acceptable to the Catholic? If they are unacceptable, as, on the other hand, they enter into the very constitution of this *historical ideal*, which is proposed as "*a goal capable of being fully and integrally desired, and of effectively drawing towards itself and effectively ending the human energies that will tend towards it in a more lively way when the will proposes it in its entirety*", the absurdity will follow that nothing will be done to make these *unacceptable conditions* disappear, because how can one work to change an ideal that ends the action? So, would the Christians of the time of Nero have to propose as a realizable *historical ideal*, that of a martyred Christianity, and those of the time of the Western Schism a Christianity torn by schism, and those of the time of the Reformation, a Christianity divided by heresy, and those of the modern liberal and communist era of today, a Christianity based on freedom, democracy and socialism? And since in the historical ideal of the "new Maritainian Christianity" the religious division¹⁵⁸ is a given fact, Christians should not propose anything so that this religious division disappears because how to work against the ideal that ends the action?

So evident are these absurd consequences deduced from the premises laid down by Maritain that it has become visible in the supporters of Maritainism, beginning with Maritain himself, the desire to "bury the dead"¹⁵⁹ , that is, to finish destroying Christian civilization and bury it, in order to found on its ruin a totally new Christian civilization, which, breaking all its connections with the past, rests on freedom and democracy sanctified by the Church. Such a "fraternal city", the Humanism

¹⁵⁶ [*L a M* ed. esp. 1945 indicates: "Cited on p. 259"; fr. ed.: "Page 259"; omit. citation ed. 1967].

¹⁵⁷ *Du régime*, p. 130. [*L a M* ed. fr. cit. p. 133].

¹⁵⁸ *Du régime*, p. 123. [*L a M* ed. fr. cit. p. 125].

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 118. [*M* ed. fr. cit. p. 120].

Integral or theocentric, whose establishment so urges Maritain that he is seen, feverishly, joining the ranks of the Revolution in the absurd attempt to hasten the burial of Christian civilization¹⁶⁰ .

Nevertheless, even if this *concrete historical ideal* did not contain bad and detestable conditions, it would imply, by the very fact of its *concreteness*, that is, of the individual and concrete conditions under which it is proposed for action, a limit to the perfection that man's intention must have. Just as man can never attain perfection as the ideal of his holiness, according to the teaching of Jesus Christ, so he must propose to himself as the ideal of the Christian social order *the perfect concord of the priesthood and the empire*, even though he may never attain it. Therein lies the norm of his action. And each one will have to answer for the part that may be due to him in the failure of that realization.

On the other hand, the desire to point out beforehand and *a priori*, the characteristics of a "new Christianity" that *must regulate* the action of Christians does not exempt us from incurring in the reproof that the Lord gave to his Apostles when he told them: "*It is not for you to know times or moments that the Father has reserved in his power*"¹⁶¹ because this implies not only to know them but to fix them. It is perfectly understandable that man, both individually and socially, having fixed his mind and the purpose of his will to fulfill, as far as possible, that fundamental doctrine of all Christian civilization, tries to accommodate his action to it, under the direction of the Church, in the historical circumstances that are presented to him. It is evident that from this fulfillment a concrete historical realization of Christianity will emerge..., but it will emerge *a posteriori* and as a result that could only have been fixed by Divine Providence in its inscrutable and secret designs. But this concrete realization cannot be fixed *a priori* without diminishing the Providence to whom we want to point out the path of the human, and without diminishing that norm which will be substituted *a priori* by a diminished and deficient realization, as is everything concrete.

Let us not fail to point out, moreover, how far removed from the pontifical directives, expressly given, and how dangerous what Maritain teaches concerning the

¹⁶⁰ ["...de la Revolución para apurar este entierro." in esp. ed. 1945; "...de la Révolution pour presser cet enterrement." in fr. ed. (n. d. e.)].

¹⁶¹ Acts, I, 7.

collaboration of the philosopher and the man of action so that they can respond on "what should be for the Christian, given the age we are entering, this concrete historical ideal, this dynamic image of the future".

It is precisely Lamennais, who arrogated to himself such faculties, that Gregory XVI, in the *Mirari Vos*, rebukes: "*Let those, then, who claim that to the Roman Pontiff alone, as St. Leo testifies, has been entrusted the constitution of the canons; and that to him alone, and not to another, it belongs to judge about the ancient decrees, or as St. Gelasius says: 'weigh the decrees of the canons, to measure the precepts of their predecessors in order to temper, having diligent consideration, those things whose modification the necessity of the times demands'*".

Although Christian civilization is of the natural order, it is so intrinsically linked to the mission of the Church herself that no one, without grave temerity, can dare to point out the paths by which it should be directed, if he has no mandate to do so.

To this error corresponds the formation of that *lay Catholic pseudo-hierarchy* of leftist Catholic intellectuals with exponents such as Maritain and Bernanos in France and with less conspicuous exemplars elsewhere, who pretend to give norm and open new channels to the Universal Church in temporal problems of the present time.

Concord between the priesthood and the empire described as utopia

Maritain, in an uneven and confusing exposition¹⁶², comes to qualify as *utopia* the Catholic doctrine that Leo XIII calls *concord of the priesthood and the empire*. On the one hand, he characterizes the notion of *utopia* in this way¹⁶³: "When a Thomas More or a Fenelon, a Saint Simon or a Fourier build a *utopia*, they build a *being of reason*, isolated from all existence and from all particular historical climate, expressing an *absolute* maximum of social and political perfection, and of whose architecture the imaginary detail is carried as far as possible...".

¹⁶² *Humanisme Intégral*, pp. 135-224. ["139-2242 in esp. ed. 1945; "p. 135 et 214" in ed. fr.]

¹⁶³ Ibid., p. 135. [140 in esp. ed. 1945].

possible, since it is a fictitious model proposed to the spirit *instead* of reality".

Even though Maritain does not *expressly* point out anything there, he does label as utopian the Catholic doctrine of *the concord of the priesthood and the empire* and therefore replaces it with the *concrete historical ideal* of his invention, which is not¹⁶⁴ "a being of reason but an ideal *essence* realizable (more or less difficultly, more or less imperfectly, this is another matter, and not as a work done but as a work that is being done), an essence capable of existence and calling into existence for a given historical climate, responding therefore to a *relative maxim* (relative to this historical climate and of social and political perfection and presenting only) -precisely because it implies an effective order in concrete existence-, the lines of force and the subsequently determinable outlines of a future reality". What is the purpose of all this so difficult, so uneven, exposition? To affirm what we read on page 223: "Taken in its essence, the medieval ideal of a sacral Christian society is certainly not bad, since it *has been* good. But existentially it corresponds to something finished. If we are allowed to employ in a paradoxical way the language of metaphysics in the register of the philosophy of history, let us say that this ideal or this prospective image has truly been an *essence*, *that is*, an intelligible complex capable of existence and demanding existence, but that at present and in relation to the concrete and dated existence of the historical age into which we are entering, it can only be a *being of reason* conceived at¹⁶⁵ *instar entis* and incapable of existing." But to this answers not a philosopher nor a theologian, but the Roman Chair through the mouth of Leo XIII in *Immortale Dei*, when after describing the goods that the philosophy of the Gospel brought to the Christian Europe of the Middle Ages, he adds: "These same goods would certainly have remained *even now* if *the concord between both powers had also persevered*; and greater would have been expected if the authority, the magisterium and the counsels of the Church were received by the civil power with greater fidelity, generous attention and constant obsequiousness. The following words written by Ivon of Chartres to the Roman Pontiff Paschal II deserve to be heard as the *formula of a perpetual law*:

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 152. [140 in esp. ed. 1945 ; and 135 in fr. ed., strangely coinciding with the above quotation, but as can be seen indicating p. 152 is the 1967 ed. in which s.e. the above quotation retains the indication of p. 135 as the fr. ed.].

¹⁶⁵ ["*ad*" in ed. fr.]

When the empire and the priesthood live in good harmony, the world is well governed and the Church flourishes and fructifies; when they are in discord, not only do little things fail to grow, but great things themselves decay miserably and perish."

Leo XIII calls *perpetual law* what for the philosopher Maritain is an *entity of reason*. And in truth, the *medieval order* in what is *essential* to it, that is, in the subordination of life and public power to the Holy Church, is the *only* possible *Christian order* and the only one which, yesterday as today, can save peoples. If this order is not possible, in new *accidental* conditions, but which do not modify its essence, it will be because the peoples have grown so much in malice that they no longer have a remedy; but, nevertheless, what is not possible for man, is possible for God, so that it would never be licit to be so radically pessimistic. But it must be noted that the medieval order, in what is essential to it, is simply the Christian social order, and to affirm that this order is utopian is to affirm that the¹⁶⁶ *Quas Primas* of Pius XI is also utopian.

To conclude the present question I think it is appropriate to recall that, whatever the historical circumstances of the times, the teaching of the Church in the Dogmatic Bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII: "*It is necessary that temporal authority submit to spiritual authority*", is as true and certain today, as it was in the days of the Apostles when a handful of men presented themselves to the hostility of a world of Jews and infidels, as it was in the days of St. Augustine and of the Holy Roman Germanic Empire and as it will be tomorrow in the days of the universal apostasy of the Antichrist; as true and certain today in Spain and Argentina as in England, the United States and Russia; as true and certain in the world of ideas as in the world of action - though not in the world of living conduct because of the impiety of men - and then as now, this truth must serve as a standard of conduct that drives the action of individuals, families and States, because "yesterday, today and forever", Jesus Christ is King of the Nations. That this norm of action in the concrete circumstances of a place and of a historical moment, must be limited to an imperfect realization, or almost nonexistent because of a *factual* impossibility that, due to the malice of men, these circumstances offer, is admissible; but even then, it will be the obligation of individuals,

¹⁶⁶ ["la", typographical error; "l'encyclique" in fr. ed.]

of families and States to employ all their energies, under the rule of prudence, in each particular case, so that those resistances, derived from circumstances of fact, disappear and the most perfect concord of the Empire and the Priesthood is achieved, in recognition of the universal vassalage, due to the Kingship of Jesus Christ.

The doctrine of falsely applied analogy

To claim to maintain the invariability of the Catholic doctrine on Christianity and at the same time to fabricate a theory where an infinite number of Christianities, essentially different types of it, all equally acceptable and desirable, could fit, would require an extraordinary dialectical effort, difficult to accomplish for those who were not endowed with the exceptional intellectual gifts that must be recognized to Maritain. The philosopher of Meudon, who made Thomism his public profession, was going to find in the famous theory of the "analogy of proper proportionality" a seemingly saving weapon.

In *Humanisme Intégral*, published in 1936, Maritain formulates this application that he had already sufficiently hinted at in *Du Régime Temporel* by reacting against a univocist conception of the concept of Christianity and proposing for it his theory of the "thesis" and the "hypothesis".

"In other words," writes¹⁶⁷, "it is not in a *univocal* way how such a conception can be realized in the different ages of the world. It is in an *analogical* way... the true solution is to be found in the philosophy of *analogy*. The principles do not vary, nor do the supreme practical rules of human life; but they are applied in essentially different ways that do not respond to the same concept but according to a similarity of proportions.... Hence the particular problem that we wanted to treat now and that we will formulate in the following terms: should a new Christianity, in the conditions of the historical age in which we are entering, always embodying the *same* principles

¹⁶⁷[citation p. "152 et seq." in esp. ed. 1945; "P. 114 et sq. (Parenthèses et passages soulignés sont de Maritain" in fr. ed.; the reference is missing, evidently by mistake, in ed. 1967].

(analogical), be conceived according to a type *essentially* (specifically) different from that of the medieval world? We answer this question in the affirmative. We think that a new age of the world will allow the principles of every vitally Christian civilization to be realized according to a new concrete analogy". (The underlining and brackets are Maritain's).

Maritain affirms, in substance, that the Catholic doctrine on Christianity does not imply a *univocal* but an analogical conception. That is to say that the word Christianity does not comprise a single essence, *simpliciter eadem*, but several totally diverse essences (*simpliciter diversa*) and *secundum quid tamen eadem*; that is, *per aliquam proportionem*, identical with everything in some respect, namely by some proportion¹⁶⁸. To use the classical example in the School of analogical name of proper proportionality, we would say that on this hypothesis Christianity would be a notion like that of "knowledge" which is said of both sense and intelligence because, although sight, for example, like intelligence "know," these are, two essentially diverse knowledges - two totally diverse essences - which do not coincide except in a similarity of relations. "In the analogy of proper proportionality - Maritain teaches¹⁶⁹ - we have an *analogous* concept of its own ("knowledge", said of sense and intelligence; "being", said of the creature and of God) which designates in each of the subjects of which something is said that is notified by the *similarity of relations* that have respectively each of the subjects (sense) to the term (knowledge) designated in it by this concept, and the other (intelligence) to the term (knowledge) similarly designated in it by the same concept".

Consequently, both medieval Christianity and Maritain's new Christianity would be "Christianity", but they would be so as two totally diverse essences. Consequently, "Christianity" as any analogous name of proper proportionality would necessarily be polyvalent; it would involve in itself not one but many diverse essences, like the concept of being which is not "*unum in multis*", but as a variable involving an actual multiplicity and realized in several without establishing among them a community of essence".¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁸ Garrigou-Lagrange, *Dieu*, p. 531.

¹⁶⁹ *Les Degrés du Savoir*, Desclée de Brouwer, 1932, Paris, p. 823.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 423.

The reader should note that the essentially diverse realizations of an *analogous* concept come from the same concept, which, properly speaking, is not one, but multiple, polyvalent. It realizes diverse applications because it is, in itself, diverse. The concept of "Christianity" then, if this were accurate, would involve in itself essential differences within a single and same doctrine on "Christianity". A consequence hitherto unheard of in Catholic theology, which knows only a single and identical principle of Christianity, which is that of *ecclesiastical public law* and which is summed up in the public and plenary recognition of the rights of the Holy Church; which rights are as invariable and permanent as the Church itself. That if they vary in the applications it is not by virtue of *themselves* but by reason of the matter or circumstances to which they apply; therefore those differences coming from the materialization of the concept do not imply but purely individual differences - never essential - like the concept of man that is realized unequally in Peter, John and Andrew, with inequalities coming, not from the concept of man itself, but from the individuating matters, and, therefore, insufficient to establish essential diversity.

I repeat: one and the same doctrine, which, without undergoing essential alteration, can have essentially diverse applications, is something, up to now, unheard of in Catholic schools. It is simply an absurdity. For how is it possible for B and C, identical with A, to be essentially diverse from each other, if differences specifying diversity are not assigned to A? And how can differences be assigned if A -the Catholic doctrine- has but one and only one statement? Someone will say: "the essential differentiation in B and C comes from the fact that one and the other are different concrete realizations of A". And how much has it been seen - we ask - that concreteness in individual circumstances can produce essential differences? It is perfectly understandable, for example, that the same Christian doctrine on holiness is realized in accidentally different ways, but never essentially different, because in this case there would be a modification in the doctrine itself.

Maritain's attempt, impossible and absurd, demonstrates the weakness of his whole whimsical construction of the new Christianity.

*New style of holiness*¹⁷¹

If, because human social conditions can diversify almost infinitely, we were to admit diverse Christianities, it would follow that we would have to admit in Christianity essentially different types of holiness. For what is Christianity if not the social projection of individual holiness? And what is Christianity if not the public recognition, by the nations, of these same rights? Therefore, if there are diverse Christianities, with equal reason there must be diverse sanctities, totally diverse essences of sanctity. The consequence is rigorous. But Maritain is careful not to incur in such a blunder that would immediately turn against him the constant teaching of the magisterium of the Church. Let us not speak," he hastens to say¹⁷², "of a new type of holiness; this word would be misleading; the Christian knows only one *type* of holiness eternally manifested in Christ. But changing historical conditions can give rise to new ways, new styles of holiness...".

The inconsistency of the philosopher is manifest. The logic of his theory on the *new* Christianity leads him to admit a theory on a new holiness, new in its *essentials* as new in its *essentials* is his Christianity. But he stops because he knows that the *explicit* teachings of the ecclesiastical Magisterium prevent him in such a peremptory way that a thesis of this nature, which touches the most sacred and vital of the Church, which is the very notion of holiness, would immediately make him the target of the most universal reprobations of theologians and even of the Magisterium itself. If Maritain allows himself to establish such a whimsical and pilgrim theory on the very notion of Christianity, it is because he also knows that, in ecclesiastical practice, greater freedom is tolerated in this respect. But the love of truth must have made him reflect that it is not possible to admit different essential types of Christianity and refuse to admit those of sanctity. And if in one case such an admission is legitimate and in the other not, he should have given the reasons that in his opinion justified such a perverse position. Because if Christianity arises, as it is

¹⁷¹ [In the fr. ed. this subtitle is missing].

¹⁷² *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 128 [*L a M* 1945 cit. p. 133].

The sanctification of all states of life is notorious, since they comprise in their totality all the individual and social relations of human life, and if, in spite of this, there is only one *essence* of holiness, how is it possible to admit *diverse* essences of Christianity? The principle of St. Thomas "*idem autem oportet esse iudicium de fine totius multitudinis, et unius*"¹⁷³ is fully applicable here.

Diversity of civilization and Christianity

But it is not difficult to discover from where the Maritainian thesis on the essential diversity of Christianity originates. He conceives Christianity as a substantially natural reality; and founded on the principle that natural civilizations can be diverse, he concludes that Christianity must also be diverse. Hence, in the pages¹⁷⁴ where he studies these questions, he adduces that teaching of the Angelic, *diversas vitas faciunt et per consequens diversas respublicas*.

^NBut even if we were to concede that civilizations existing outside the Church are essentially diverse, it would not follow that they must also be so once they are incorporated into the Church. The reason lies in the fact that Christianity, although it is a *temporal* and perishable *social reality*, cannot be said to be truly *natural*. For it is the temporal social order *substantially* united to the Church, as the body to the soul, and the Church being a *supernatural form*, from it Christianity receives its measure and denomination. Insofar as it verifies the concept, Christianity is a *supernaturalized* civilization, sanctified by the Church. Chinese civilization may be very different from Greco-Roman or Germanic civilization, but as soon as one or the other is truly and vitally incorporated into the Holy Church, *adopting its doctrine as a public principle of life*, there is but one single civilization, which is Christianity. To imagine the perseverance of the diversity of civilizations after their incorporation into the Church implies conceiving the bond of union between the Church and this civilization, like the bond that exists between the motor and the body to which it gives motion, a purely *extrinsic* bond proper to the cause of the Church.

¹⁷³ *De Regimine principum*, I, 14.

¹⁷⁴ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 144 [*L a M* 1945 cit. p. 150].

efficient. But this is not how the constant ecclesiastical tradition conceives this link. St. Thomas, who wisely takes up this traditional teaching, teaches us¹⁷⁵ that "*the secular power is subject to the spiritual as the body to the soul*" and this way of conceiving and expressing it has received the sanction of the authority of Leo XIII in the encyclicals *Immortale Dei* and *Libertas*, when he says: "It is therefore necessary that there be between the two powers a certain ordered interweaving; an *intimate interweaving*, which not without reason is compared to that of *the soul with the body in man*". As someone might object that these expressions have no more value than that of simple metaphors, we ask, why have they employed this metaphor and not those that denote pure extrinsic and efficient causality, such as that of the motor and the mobile, or the agent and patient? If we take into account the exactness with which theologians, such as St. Thomas and Pope Leo XIII, express themselves, it is clear that they wanted to express the intimate union- "*intimate interweaving*," says Leo XIII- as that which exists between the body and soul of the human composite, and not purely extrinsic. On the other hand, even without this metaphor, the intimate nature of this union arises from the very unity of human action which, by reason of man's unity, can propose only one ultimate end, which must inform all his actions. If theologians, in expressing themselves in this matter, speak of subordination and not of coordination, it is because they demand the intrinsic union of two causes - the temporal institutions and the divine Institution of the Church - in the production of a single and unique effect, namely, the Christian city or civilization.

If this is so, since there is only one Church, there can be only one - numerically one- Christian civilization. For beings that originate by a communication of substantial form cannot multiply if the substantial forms do not multiply, which is not possible when the latter is unique. Christianity can only be unique throughout time and space. It matters not that some States are subtracted from the vivification of the Church and that others submit to it; Christian civilization is neither multiplied nor lost, just as a tree does not lose the uniqueness of its being because new branches sprout and others wither and die.

Outside the Church, civilizations may multiply numerically and even in species, genera, or analogical or even totally equivocal creations,

¹⁷⁵ II. II. 60. 6. ad 3.

as the principles of life that govern the various States multiply; but, in the Church and when the States are incorporated into Her, they receive a new principle of being and of life, which constitutes them in a new and unique Christian civilization. Throughout the two millennia of the Church's survival in the world, Christian civilization - Christianity - perseveres substantially the same; all the changes which, by reason of human transformations, take place in the States, can only signify variations and accidental changes in Christian civilization itself.

This way of conceiving a single Christian civilization demands that we discard a static imagery and, on the contrary, imagine it as an organism, driven by a vital dynamic, which, in the various stages through which Christian civilization is passing - we do not say the Church or, if you like, we say the Church, but considering it precisely in its activity on the temporal which does not exhaust all the virtualities of its being and activity - in these various stages - we say - it is taking on accidentally diverse forms and realizations that come from two main types of changes: the first, derived from the resistances that the temporal -in the genre of material cause- offers to the spiritual, and which do not allow it to act fully and completely. Just as in an organism, where sick or traumatic organs can appear, produced not precisely by deficiencies in the vigor of the soul, but rather as breaks in the body that impede the full action of the soul. Christian civilization has suffered changes, for this kind of causes, derived from heresies, schism and the sins of the clergy, of the princes and of the people; evils that have brought about the death, not precisely of the Christian civilization itself, but of its members, as was the schism of the Greek Orthodox world, and modernly, that of England, Prussia and the defection of France. These splits in Christianity can be compared to branches totally or partially dried up, whose disappearance, or mutation, does not entail a substantial change in the tree itself.

Another kind of causes, which can bring variation in the Christian civilization, comes not from a deficient, but from the same and still full performance that, by informing heterogeneous elements - internal heterogeneity, because of the national and cultural historical heritages and the vocations of the different human groups - brings also a heterogeneity of members of the different human groups.

according to the peculiar function of each one and also to the stage of life of the same and unique civilization. In the same way as in the human compound, where the same spiritual soul informs a heterogeneous body, with very diverse members, even also the same being with characteristics as diverse as those that exist in the same man, as a child, as an adolescent and as a mature man or in old age.

Pius X fully confirmed this doctrine of the uniqueness of Christian civilization, both in *il fermo proposito* and in the *Letter condemning the errors of the "Sillon"*.

There he says that "*Christian civilization is not to be invented*"⁰ ; that "*it has existed and exists*"; that "*it is only a question of establishing and restoring it unceasingly on its natural and divine foundations against the ever renewed attacks of unhealthy utopia, rebellion and impiety: Omnia instaurare in Christo*"; that it has been founded with "*the sufferings of millions of martyrs, the lights of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, the abnegation of all the heroes of charity, a powerful hierarchy, born in heaven, and all built up, united, interpenetrated by the life and spirit of Jesus Christ....*"; that "*it is not necessary to detach oneself from the past, but it is enough to tie together... the organisms broken by the revolution and to adapt them with the same spirit in which they were animated, to the new environment created by the material evolution of contemporary society...*".

In order to give a semblance of justification to his concept of Christianity which, as we have seen, does not reconcile with the Thomistic concept, Maritain in his *Réligion et Culture* compares Catholicism, the informing principle of Christian culture, to a "transcendent living being, he says, and independent and vivifying - a little^P (but every comparison is deficient), like a spiritual soul that would subsist apart, and in the manner of the "separate intellect" of the Averroists and that would communicate of its life to diverse living beings"¹⁷⁶. (The parenthesis is Maritain's). Absurd comparison, which does not avoid its contradiction with the constant ecclesiastical doctrine and which only aims at justifying the Maritainian thesis of the multiplicity of Christian civilizations.

¹⁷⁶ *Réligion et Culture*, p. 53 [*L a M* 1945 cit. p. 54].

But let us raise a question that we have so far taken for granted. Is it sufficiently proven that civilizations outside of Christianity could multiply not only numerically but even *essentially*, if they could be verified in their *integrity and fullness*? We think not. And the reason emerges clearly from the doctrine set forth above on the notion of civilization. If human life, both individual and social, is ordered to the divine contemplation of Truth and to the possession of the Supreme Good, there being but *one Truth and one Good*, and there being but *one* way for man to attain it, there can be but one *species* of civilization, just as there is but one *species* of man.

Civilizations could multiply, for individual and accidental reasons, as various individuals within the same species, but never as diverse essences. It is clear that, in fact, and by the malice of men who place their happiness, who in honors, who in wealth or glory, who in pleasure, who in Money, who in Work, and so on, civilizations multiply diversely; but insofar as they diversify, they also depart from the right norm that should govern man in his formal condition of *humanity*.

In this perspective, but only in this perspective, the text of St. Thomas invoked by Maritain is valid: "*The diversity of cities* (Polit. VII, 6; II. II. q. 61. a. 2.) comes from the diversity of ends or of different ways of tending to the same end and men constitute diverse common lives and therefore diverse cities, *diverse vitas faciunt et per consequens diverse respublicas*". But let us not forget that there is but one way of being *simpliciter good* and therefore there can be but one truly human civilization. "*Virtue being*," says the Angelic¹⁷⁷, "*that which makes the one who possesses it good, it follows that the proper effect of the law, is to make those to whom it is given, good either simpliciter or secundum quid. For if the intention of the one who establishes the law is directed to that which is not*
If the law does not make men "simpliciter" good, but useful or delightful, or contrary to divine justice, then the law does not make men "simpliciter" good, but only "secundum quid", that is, in order to such a regime. In this way the good is also found in those who, in themselves, are bad; like someone who is called a good thief because he acts in conformity with the end".

¹⁷⁷ I. II. 92. 1.

Before moving on, we must warn ourselves that this question about the very notion of Christianity is not purely *verbal* and therefore idle. On the contrary, it constitutes the key to all the other errors and deviations of Maritain, and what is more important, it points out the very nature of his deviations, namely the typical error of what is called in Theology "Catholic liberalism". It is well known that with the encyclical "Libertas" of Leo XIII, published on June 20, 1888, the tripartite classification of liberalism, first made *official* by Father Mateo Liberatore of the Society of Jesus, in his famous articles of the *Civiltà Cattolica*, later collected in a volume with the title of *The Church and the State*. Father Liberatore distinguishes there, the "absolute" liberalism, qualified by Leo XIII, of "terrible kind of liberalism", which does not recognize any right neither divine nor human, out of what determines the reason of the man; with all rigor it is this, an atheistic system that makes of the man, individual or collective, a god. A "mitigated" liberalism that recognizes the subjection of man to divine-natural laws, but not to supernatural ones. Consequently, the Church, which is presented as a *perfect supernatural society*, is recognized only as an independent and autonomous society, within the sphere of conscience, but without public rights as such. And finally, a liberalism, called liberal Catholicism or Catholic liberalism, which accepts, in *theory*, the full Catholic doctrine on Church and State, but refuses its *practical application*. "These," says Liberatore, "shun discussion in the abstract field of reasoning; but coming to the concrete of facts, they consider more prudent and more useful to the Church herself her total separation from the State. They recall the wrongs suffered by her during the slavery in which the princes of former times endeavored to keep her under color of protection; and they advise her to renounce for herself the unhappy consortium, and, reducing herself to her moral forces alone, neither to claim nor to expect any aid from the civil power, nor to pretend to exercise any influence in any branch of political power. As for the so-called modern liberties, they say that the Church can and should accept them without misgivings, since they cannot but produce advantages, there being nothing so much in conformity with the nature of man as the enjoyment of full political and religious liberty, shaking off every yoke of servitude and restriction. He says that in any case, this is the universal tendency of modern society, and to contradict it is a mad determination that can produce no other result than that of alienating more and more the minds to Religion, with irreparable damage, not only to civil society, but also to the whole of society.

also of the Church itself. This is the explanation of these courageous apologists, who, with an enchanting simplicity, consider themselves as the only ones who see clearly, the true connoisseurs of the world, the prudent par excellence, the legitimate defenders of Catholic interests, and they launch themselves in a fierce manner against anyone who contradicts them, without omitting the obligatory panegyric of charity and moderation"¹⁷⁸ .

The refutation of this liberalism, formulated by the theologians, is based on its "inconsistency"¹⁷⁹ or "incoherence"¹⁸⁰ , and they qualify it as a false doctrine "at least medially opposed to revealed doctrine" (Muncunil¹⁸¹). The "Syllabus" expresses it in the following condemned propositions:

"It is no longer appropriate in our time that the Catholic Religion should be considered the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of any other religion".

78. "Hence in some Catholic countries it has been laudably provided by law that men who enter them shall be permitted the public exercise of their worship."

79. "It is certainly false that the *civil liberty of any cult* and the full faculty granted to all to manifest publicly and clearly their opinions and thoughts leads to the easiest corruption of the spirits and customs of the people and to propagate the plague of indifferentism."

80. "The Roman Pontiff can and must reconcile and compromise with progress, with liberalism and with civilization."

It is important to bear in mind that this type of Catholic liberalism, expressly condemned, is what Maritain is guilty of, in order to appreciate how ineffective are the attempts at defense made by Maritain himself or by his disciples, real or presumed, when, when reproached for this very serious error, they feel that they have been wrongly accused.

¹⁷⁸ Liberatore, *The Church and the State*, p. 11.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 22.

¹⁸⁰ Billot, *De Ecclesia*, 2 ed., t. II, p. 51.

¹⁸¹ Muncunill, *De Ecclesia*, p. 594.

seriously and gratuitously offended¹⁸² and invoke, in defense, the works, very excellent and meritorious on the other hand, where Maritain has exposed *theoretically* -without practical value- the good doctrine or where he has rejected the other forms of liberalism that no one imputes to him.

This Catholic liberalism is not to be considered as a rigid system but as a set of more or less coherent tendencies, registering a variety of degrees, whose deviations and dangers must be examined in each case. Still historically, Catholic liberalism takes one form in Lamennais, another in Montalembert and Dupanloup, another in the "Christian democracy" movement of Dabry, Lemire, Naudet, another in the Americanism condemned in the *Testem Benevolentiae*, another in the *Sillon* movement. Its danger and deviation is all the greater in that it tends to set itself up as a *theory* or *philosophy* of life. Under this aspect in the "New Christianity" of Maritain are hidden greater deviations than in the same conception of Lamennais.

On the other hand, even if the theoretical statement with which Catholic liberalism is clothed is more benign and acceptable than the other impious forms of liberalism, of a Rousseau, Kant, Hartmann, etc., for example, in practical reality it can prove to be more harmful. For it weakens, from within the Church itself, the Rule of social life which is to regulate the action of Catholics.

In any case, Catholic liberalism, by abandoning in practical application the only Catholic Rule of social life that the Church proposes in the *concord of the priesthood and the empire*, will have to adopt *another* Rule of edification, which, not being the Catholic one, will in fact influence the edification of the city of the devil, no matter how much it invokes "Christianity". For since there are only two cities throughout human history, the "city of men" and the "city of God," as St. Augustine says (L. XV, 1), he who abandons in lived reality the Rule of edification left by Christ to his Holy Church, must adopt *another* Rule that will influence the edification of the Fraternal City of Man.

¹⁸² Letter of Maritain to Cgo. Luis Arturo Pérez, from Santiago de Chile, and from Maritain,

Raison et Raisons, Egloff, Paris, 1947, pp. 259 ff.

THE NEW CHRISTENDOM, NATURALISTIC CITY

Who is a liar but he who denies that Jesus is the Christ? (Epistle I of St. John, II, 22).

The alteration to which Maritain submits the formal concept of Christianity must entail a serious alteration of the very *reality* in which this concept is verified. And since every evil is all the more serious the higher are the parts of the being in which it produces damage, from where it is then communicated to the lower parts, we will study the loss that Christianity suffers in the Maritainian conception, first of all in what refers to the rights of God and the Church, and then in what touches the public power. Thus we will consider the naturalism or *profanation* of the Catholic city and its *liberalism* or rebellion.

The "naturalistic" error, which is also called "rationalism" or "philosophism," is the peculiar and distinctive heresy of the modern world. It proclaims the sufficiency of human nature to attain its happiness. At bottom it constitutes the very essence of all heresies. For, in one form or another, heresies are a turning of human nature against the truths communicated to us by Revelation. The heretic substitutes for "his truth", for the doctrine as he understands it with his human lights, the Truth that, through the authentic Magisterium, God proposes to him. Naturalism is the radical negation of all supernatural truth for the sake of being supernatural. In the implicit affirmation that philosophy - the science of man - is enough and theology - the science of God - is not necessary to perfectly order man. Hence the apostles, with pressing exhortations¹⁸³, urged the early Christians to "*beware of the seductions of philosophy*" and reminded them of the words of the Scriptures¹⁸⁴: "*I will destroy the wisdom of the wise and cast away the prudence of the prudent*"¹⁸⁵.

¹⁸³ Col. II, 8.

¹⁸⁴ Isaiah, XXIX, 14.

¹⁸⁵ I Cor. I, 19.

Never did human pride become so deeply and universally infatuated as after the great heresy of the Reformation, when reason, under the pretext of breaking the chains that imprisoned it, overflowed in infinite delusions. For this reason, the Vatican Council, assembled in the name of the God of Revelation, in fulminating anathema against modern errors, says in the Prologue of the "Dogmatic Constitution of the Catholic Faith," after referring to Protestantism: *"There was born then and spread inordinately everywhere that doctrine of rationalism or naturalism, which, placing itself in total contradiction with the Christian religion, by reason of the supernatural character of this Institution, schemes with extraordinary ardor to exclude Jesus Christ, Our only Lord and Savior, from human intelligences, from the life and customs of peoples, in order to establish the kingdom of what they call pure reason or nature."*

Among the most visible fathers of modern rationalism are Descartes, Bacon, Spinoza, Hobbes, Hume, Locke, Wolf, Kant, Hegel, Voltaire and Rousseau in the eighteenth century, who set themselves up as propagandists of rationalism in France and fanatically worked to dissolve French society, which then ended up worshipping the goddess Reason. Emancipated from faith, the presumed deity indulged in all sorts of extravagances, and in the most unlikely delusions. There is, in fact, no folly, however great it may be supposed to be, which has not been invented and propagated by some philosopher. Hence, the words of the Holy Vatican Council are so accurate and correct: *"But after having abandoned and rejected the Christian religion and having denied God and his Christ, the intelligence of many has finally fallen into the abyss of pantheism, materialism and atheism, so that, denying rational nature itself and all the norms of what is just and right, they unite their efforts to undermine the deepest foundations of human society"*.

The independence or emancipation of reason, hence the terrible heresy of rationalism or naturalism which then engenders the social errors of secularism, liberalism, socialism and communism. Beneath all these errors and as constituting their deepest root is the greatest of all sins which, as St. Thomas teaches¹⁸⁶ is that of infidelity. *"For all sin consists formally in aversion to God, as has been said (I. II. 71. 6). Hence, a sin is so much more serious the more man separates himself from God by it. Now by unfaithfulness man is alienated from God in the highest degree; for he has not the true knowledge of God; and by*

¹⁸⁶ II, II, II, 10, 3.

False knowledge does not approach God but moves away from him. Nor can he know God who has a false opinion of him, because whatever he thinks is not God. From whence it is manifest that the sin of infidelity is the greatest of all the sins that take place in the perversity of manners".

On the other hand, of all the species of infidelity the worst is that of the heretics who reject the faith after having received it¹⁸⁷. Then naturalism and rationalism, which St. Thomas describes as "*apostasy of perfidy*"¹⁸⁸ is the most monstrous moral aberration in the history of morals.

Maritain, evidently, does not incur in these very serious errors. On the contrary, with energy and above all with extraordinary effectiveness, he has been combating them in works that have become famous throughout the civilized world. *Théonas, Antimoderne, La Philosophie Bergsonienne, Trois Réformateurs, Les degrés du Savoir, Primauté du Spirituel, Reflexions sur l'intelligence*, testify to a powerful intelligence placed at the service of an integral Catholic faith.

Maritain, who consequently rejects the modern errors of naturalism or rationalism, professes the essential and constitutive principles of Catholicism, viz: That man was created, in the supernatural state of righteousness, entitled to the intuitive vision of God; that his sin entailed upon him the loss of original righteousness for himself and all his descendants; That the Word of God became flesh and, by his passion and death, restored that primitive state, establishing, after his resurrection, the supernatural society of the Sons of God; that this society, called the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church, is the only depository of the Truth and Grace of Christ, without which man and peoples do not obtain their health.

These are the principles that Maritain professes. For this reason, in the examination of his philosophical-political theories, we place ourselves in the hypothesis that these principles, and all that derives from them, are beyond discussion. But then -one may ask- if Maritain admits these essential principles of Christianity, why this attempt to cast a shadow of doubt on the orthodoxy of a work that is recognized as meritorious?

¹⁸⁷ I, II, 71, 6.

¹⁸⁸ II, II, 12, 1.

Because Maritain, who professes to be a fervent Catholic philosopher, has forged a "practical" theory, that is, one ordered to regulate the moral actions of Catholics in the social order, which is called the "new Christianity", or "integral humanism", or, the "fraternal city"; now, what is under discussion is this "new Christianity". Does this fraternal city accept those fundamental truths that constitute the essence of the Catholic Faith? Because, if he does not accept them or if he does not give them the place they deserve, Maritain may be personally Catholic, but the city he imagines in his "new Christianity" will not be. And in this case, leaving aside the merits and intentions of the Catholic philosopher, it would be necessary to challenge a norm of social life that, when proposed as a guiding term for the social action of Catholics, would contribute to produce confusion and ruin.

The question we raise is, in principle, perfectly legitimate. There are innumerable cases of excellent Catholics and even extraordinary theologians who have proposed erroneous and disastrous theories. No one, however, has the right to reprove them of their personal Catholic faith until it is established with certainty that they have held such theories, after becoming certain of their incompatibility with the teachings of the Church, or, what would be more serious, after becoming aware of this incompatibility in concrete terms, by an authentic manifestation of the Church herself. It was in the latter that Lamennais's disastrous mistake lay. He defended with Lacordaire, Montalembert and others, in the newspaper *l' Avenir*, an anti-Catholic political social norm. He probably defended it in *good faith*. But he did not know how to renounce it when the Magisterium let him know, in an authentic way, that he was forbidden to defend it. What Lamennais defended was as anti-Catholic before as after the condemnation; but it did not affect his *personal* integrity as a professed Catholic until after the condemnation.

Of course, does Maritain's "new Christianity" accept those essential truths so that it can truly be called a Catholic theory? It would seem so, because his books abound in explicit manifestations of this acceptance. Thus, for example, he writes: "In this new moment of the history of Christian culture, the creature will not be unknown or annihilated before God; neither will it be rehabilitated without God or against God; it will be rehabilitated *in God*. There is only one way out of the history of the world, I am speaking in the Christian regime, whatever the rest may be. May the creature be truly respected *in*

humanism, but theocentric humanism, rooted where man has his roots, integral humanism, humanism of the incarnation"¹⁸⁹ .

So true that Maritain gives place in his new Christianity to the supernatural truths of the Holy Religion¹⁹⁰ : "Briefly, they consist (the internal dimensions of the changes required for the passage to a New Christianity) in making pass a real *refraction* of the Gospel in the cultural and temporal order. It is a question of changes in the regime of human life, at once interior and exterior, which must be fulfilled in the heart and fulfilled in the city and in the institutions, and which concern together, although under different titles, the social and visible domain and the spiritual, moral and invisible domain, and in the first place the spiritual domain".

The new Christianity, at least as it emerges from Maritain's explicit declarations, then makes room for the fundamental truths of the Catholic supernatural life. How can we dare to call it naturalistic? Undoubtedly, because it is not enough that the supernatural element be somehow included in the social reality of peoples and states for the Christian character of that society to be affirmed. Modern societies accept the Holy Church in their midst, but they are not Christian societies because they expel her from public life and confine her to the sacristy. It is interesting then to know which are the guiding principles that govern Maritain's new Christianity; which are the dynamic ideas that animate it; which are the supreme principles inscribed on the gates of the city. Because it is precisely the principles recognized as supreme and decisive that constitute a nature.

Maritain has explained himself sufficiently in this regard, writing: "The dynamic principle of the common life and common work of such a civilization [the new Christianity] would not be the medieval idea of an empire to be built for God here below, and even less the myth of the Class, the Race, the Nation or the State. Let us say that it would be the idea - neither Stoic, nor Kantian, but evangelical - of the dignity of the human person and of his spiritual vocation and of the fraternal love that is due to him. The work of the city would be to realize a life

¹⁸⁹ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 80.

¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 217.

common here below, a temporal regime truly in conformity with this dignity, this vocation, this love¹⁹¹ .

"Thus it is first of all, if one wishes to have recourse to this word, under the title of a primordial "myth" director of the common life, under the title of a heroic idea to be realized, of a typical end to be pursued, of an animating theme of a common enthusiasm, putting into action the profound energies of the mass, that fraternal friendship will appear as an essential dynamic principle in this new Christianity. Because it will be truly and entirely (*tout entière*) *oriented* towards a social-temporal realization of the evangelical truths, it will be properly applied to a common profane-Christian work".¹⁹²

Consequently, "fraternal friendship", let us simply say "universal fraternity", will be the specifying end of the new Christianity. So that no one may believe that we wish to alter Maritain's thought, let us say better, "evangelical fraternal friendship". But we ask, is this end proposed by society, as such, the ultimate or supreme end, or is it simply an immediate and proximate end, subordinated to the ultimate or supreme end? We confess that the *categorical* and explicit answer to this question has never been given by Maritain. However, it is absolutely necessary.

Because it depends on it and only on it whether a city is Christian or not. We are not speaking of the individuals who make up the city, we are speaking of the city as such. Does that city which proposes "evangelical fraternal friendship" as its goal adore the true God and his Son, Jesus Christ, or does it not adore him? Does that city place *the love and glory of God* at its summit, as its first orienting Truth, so that with respect to it and *to the extent that it leads to it*, it accepts evangelical fraternal friendship, or is this its first and supreme truth, to which everything must conform? For if it does not adore Jesus Christ and recognize the divinity of the Holy Church, it will be *theistic*, but not Christian; and if, as a city, it does not adore God, it will be simply neutral and atheistic.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., p. 208.

¹⁹² Ibid., pp. 208-214.

It is a question of knowing if this "new Christianity" of Maritain accepts, in its public law, the teaching of Leo XIII on the profession of the true religion. "Since it is therefore necessary for the State to *profess a religion*, it must profess the one true religion, which is known without difficulty, especially among Catholic peoples, since in it the characteristics of the truth appear as if stamped. It is this religion, then, that those who govern *must preserve*; it is this religion that *they must protect*, if they wish, as they must, to attend prudently and usefully to the community of citizens. The public authority is, in fact, constituted for the benefit of its subjects, and although it aims at providing them with the prosperity of this earthly life, it should not diminish them, but rather increase their facility to achieve that supreme and ultimate good, in which lies the everlasting bliss of man, and which cannot be reached by neglecting religion¹⁹³". Maritain says nothing decisive in this regard. But by the structure and conformation that he gives to his new Christianity, by the characters that he assigns to it, by the dynamic principles that move it, by the agents that build it, it is sufficiently deduced that in his new Christianity the God of the Catholic Church does not have the first and fundamental place that imprescriptibly corresponds to him. Their Christianity is naturalistic.

Maritain's Christianity does not worship the God of the Catholic Church.

The God we Catholics adore is a God who "*at other times spoke to our fathers on different occasions and in many ways through the prophets, and who lately in our days has spoken to us through his Son, whom he constituted universal heir of all things*"¹⁹⁴. This is the God whom Maritain's fraternal city adores? "Finally, says¹⁹⁵, the conception of society of which we speak is theistic or Christian not in this sense that would demand that each of the members of society believe in God and be Christian, but in this sense that would recognize that in the reality of things, *God, principle and end of the human person and first principle of natural law*, is also the *first principle of political society and of authority among us*, and in this sense that would recognize that *the currents of liberty*,

¹⁹³ Libertas.

¹⁹⁴ Hebrews, I, 1.

¹⁹⁵ *Les Droits*, p. 35; English ed., p. 42.

of fraternity opened up by the Gospel, the virtues of justice and friendship sanctioned by it, the practical respect for the human person proclaimed by it, the feeling of responsibility before God required by it, both of him who exercises authority and of him who is under it, are the inner energy which civilization needs in order to reach its fulfillment".

In all that Maritain enumerates here to characterize the religion of his "new Christianity," there is nothing that requires the *theological virtue of faith*. For God, the beginning and end of the human person, the first principle of natural law, the first principle of political society and of authority among us, do not obviously require the light of revelation for their knowledge. "Indeed," says St. Paul to the Romans¹⁹⁶, "*the invisible perfections of God, even his eternal power and divinity, have been made visible after the creation of the world, by the knowledge which his creatures give us of them; and so such a man has no apology*. Any man, Jew or pagan, can and must know God, the author of nature. And the impious encyclopedists confessed themselves theists. But even the acceptance of what Maritain calls "the currents of liberty and fraternity opened by the Gospel" does not require in the man of today, precisely the *divine faith* in the truth of the Gospel; it is enough to accept them with purely human faith or by a personal conviction as one can accept the goodness of the Koran or the Baghavadghita. So true is this and so true that this Maritainian society, as a temporal society, makes no profession but, at most, of a *natural religion* that Maritain adds: "Those who do not believe in God or do not profess Christianity, if they believe in the dignity of the human person, in justice, in freedom, in love of neighbor, can also *cooperate* in the realization of such a conception of society and *cooperate in the common good*, even if they do not know how to go back to the first principles of their practical convictions, or seek to found them on deficient principles"¹⁹⁷. But if the end of the Catholic city is "supernatural" and if what is "supernatural" exceeds all the demands of a created or creatable nature, it is not possible for those who reject such an end to *cooperate* in its realization. Consequently, the guiding principles of this society are not "supernatural" Catholics because they do not exceed the limits of the natural force of reason; they are purely philosophical. It is an elementary doctrine that Catholicism

¹⁹⁶ I, 20.

¹⁹⁷ *Les Droits*, p. 36; English ed., p. 42.

professes a strictly supernatural religion. *Sacred doctrine*," teaches St. Thomas¹⁹⁸ , "properly studies God as the first and highest cause, not only in what can be known by the creature... (something that philosophers have also attained), as St. Paul says: what is known to God was manifested to them.... (something that philosophers have also achieved), as St. Paul says: what is known of God was manifested to them; but it also teaches what only God himself knows of himself, and communicates to others by revelation".

The guiding principles of an authentic Christianity, of a Christian society, can only be suspended from this supreme reality of the supernatural order. To call itself Christian it is not enough for a society to confess God; it must adore the God known by divine revelation; it must believe and profess with *divine faith* that "*the Word of God became flesh and dwelt among us*".

"*Seducer and antichrist*, calls St. John¹⁹⁹ those who do not confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh; liar he who denies that Jesus is the Christ; antichrist he who denies the Father and the Son"²⁰⁰ . And this "vitally Christian lay city" or "Christianly constituted lay state"²⁰¹ that accepts "the currents of liberty and fraternity opened by the Gospel", but does not accept the *divine truth* of the Gospel, that does not accept the *divine truth* of God made Man, that does not accept the *divine truth* of the Church, is called new Christianity?

Maritain seems to want to convince us that the society invented by him is *Christian* because it rests on *natural* principles of life, such as the human person, freedom, equality, *opened and enlivened by the Gospel* could lead us through the recognition of these principles to the recognition of the *divine truth* of the Gospel. But even if it could be admitted that the *divine truth of the Gospel* could be reached there, then it would only prove that such a society *could become Christian*. But how do you call Christianity, a city which might be Christian, but which is not Christian?

So certain is it that the new Christianity excludes social recognition of the Holy Church that Maritain says that "cooperation with religion" on the part of

¹⁹⁸ I, 1, 6.

¹⁹⁹ II, Letter, 7.

²⁰⁰ I, Letter, II, 22.

²⁰¹ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 182; *Les Droits*, p. 37; English edition, p. 45.

the temporal society is done "*respecting and facilitating, on the basis of the rights and freedom of each one, the activity of the Church and of the various religious families that are in fact grouped together in the heart of the temporal community*"²⁰². Therefore, the cooperation that the Maritainian society gives to the Holy Church of Jesus Christ does not derive from the profession of faith, of that society, in the divinity of the Church, and therefore from the recognition of the imprescriptible rights that this divinity entails, but from the rights and liberties of the citizens. The Church is recognized insofar as Christian citizens are recognized the right to *freely* practice the Catholic cult; for the same reason that other cults, heretical, schismatic and infidel, are recognized. Therefore the *divinity* of the Church is not recognized by that society, as such. Therefore, that society cannot and should not be called Christian. In a *naturalistic* society. It is a neutral state.

A neutral state benevolent towards the Church

But Maritain reacts indignantly against the insinuation of this offense. In response, made public, to Canon Luis Arturo Perez of Santiago de Chile, he writes: "Monsignor Luis Arturo Perez denounces me as a supporter of the equality of cults and religions, of religious indifferentism, of the separation of the Church and the State, and of the theses of theological liberalism regarding the relations of the Church and the State. It bothers me to have to say that these assertions are simply false. I have spent my life fighting the errors of theological liberalism. The thesis of the equality of religions and cults is, in my eyes, an absurd error. I have constantly condemned the separatism of the Modern Age, the principle of the separation of theology and philosophy, the principle of the separation of Church and State, the principle of the neutrality of the State. The solutions that I understand the new period in which we are entering are in the perspective of "civil tolerance", admitted by the pontifical encyclicals, as Monsignor Perez has repeated, by himself. They mean that the era of liberalism is over, and likewise the era of State clericalism".²⁰³

²⁰² Ibid., p. 37.

²⁰³ *Una polémica sensacional*, p. 41, Santiago de Chile, 1944.

But it is not enough to be indignant; it is not enough to say: "I have defended such and such a thing, I have sustained such and such another", if then a city is elaborated in which that which has been defended is not applied as it should be. Maritain has defended magnificently, perhaps with a *sentimental* excess of zeal, the divine rights of the Church against the grave errors of *Action Française*. But since *his Du régime temporel*, he has forged a conception of the Christian city in which these rights are seriously diminished if not ignored. Thus, as early as 1932,²⁰⁴ writes: "Those who, placing first and foremost the authentically spiritual values... would not like to oppose to the error of liberalism an opposite error, and erect, even if it were an ideal, a simple hope, a theocracy of the church in front of or alongside the theocracies of human collectivism. They recognize the need to take into account the religious divisions that the progress of time, and its malice, have inscribed in the history of the world. Without declining *towards the* They know what a just "*dogmatic tolerance*," which regards freedom from error as a good in itself, means for the human person, a just "*civil tolerance*" which imposes on the State *respect for consciences*. Moreover, as they become more aware of the proper significance of the age of culture into which we are entering, and of its opposition to the humanism of the last four centuries, they are less inclined to suppose that it will find in human means, particularly in the means of the State, the equipment required for the work of the spiritual here below"²⁰⁵ . As if the decisive thing were the effects sought, the success, and not the truth and the fulfillment by the State of the profession of the true Religion and as if the truth and the fulfillment of duty could not bear good fruits for the true honest good of the citizens. And as if this *respect for consciences* and this *exclusion of the State from the service of the Church* and this *confused*²⁰⁶ distinction between "civil tolerance" and "dogmatic tolerance" were neither more nor less than what Lamennais taught: "In what way, he says, would this freedom (that of conscience) harm conscience or honor? It alone, on the contrary, secures their rights. For, on the one hand, it leaves to each one to believe whatever seems true to him, and to act according to his beliefs so far as public order is not disturbed; and consequently, on the other hand, by establishing *the most perfect tolerance*

²⁰⁴ *Du régime*, p. 75.

²⁰⁵ See also: *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 185.

We say confused because Maritain does not keep a single basis of division. Indeed, civil toleration can be *dogmatic* if it recognizes any cult or opinion as a true right, or it can be purely

practical if it is merely a permission of an evil. Therefore civil toleration cannot, without serious confusion, be opposed to dogmatic toleration.

The Catholic, who is a civil person, does not in any degree enclose dogmatic toleration, which is nothing but the absence of all belief, and even of all opinion. Thus the Catholic does not renounce any point of his doctrine; he preaches it, defends it, propagates it by reasoning and formation, recognizing the same right to the Protestant, to the Jew, to any sect subject, on the other hand, to the laws of the country."²⁰⁷

What does Maritain mean by "civil tolerance" as opposed to "dogmatic tolerance"? That the human person has these rights not before God but before the State²⁰⁸ : "The first of these rights is that of the human person to walk towards his eternal destiny on the path that his conscience has recognized as the path traced out by God. *Faced with God and Truth*, he does not have the right to choose at will any path; he must choose the true path, insofar as it is in his power to know him. But *before the State, the temporal community and the temporal power*, he is free to choose his religious path with its risks and dangers, his freedom of conscience is an inviolable natural right".

And just as Lamennais did not place any other limitation *on consciences* than not disturbing public order, so Maritain in note²⁰⁹ : "Supposing that this religious way is so aberrant that it leads to acts contrary to the natural law and to the security of the State, the State has the right to impose interdictions and sanctions against these acts, it has no authority over the control of consciences".

Now, this State in which citizens claim as their *natural right* and entitlement to profess privately and publicly any belief or disbelief, as long as it does not disturb the public tranquility, is a *neutral* State. For if all citizens have a natural right to have their consciences respected, all have the right that the State does not *force* the conscience of each one. Thus it is that if the State *truly* professes a cult, and by virtue of this profession accepts its teachings and precepts and incorporates them into legislation, to this extent it would force consciences, inasmuch as by *the force of its public power* it would work in favor of that cult; then this State cannot

²⁰⁷ *Necessité de s'unir*, 30 Oct. 1830, t. II, p. 422.

²⁰⁸ *Les Droits*, p. 103; English ed. p. 128.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 103.

profess any cult and must be neutral. We *deliberately* say that the State *forces* consciences, because the State in what is proper and distinctive to it, insofar as it is a State, is coercion, and although it does not impose any *special law* ordering or prohibiting a particular cult, although it does not exercise any particular act of force against particular citizens, insofar as it professes a cult, it makes *the coercive force* that constitutes it, in favor of that cult, felt. Let us suppose, for example, that a State *truly* professes the Calvinist cult; consequently, that State in its legislation, culture and teaching, will be informed by Calvinism and the citizens will be *induced* to Calvinism by the very force of the State. And if the State apparently does not exercise *force* in any sense it will be because it is neutral; and even then it will exercise it in favor of the religion of "irreligion" or atheism; which is exactly what typically happens in the United States of America.

From Maritain's answer to Canon Perez²¹⁰ appears the false content of his concept of "civil tolerance", whose patronage he would like to attribute to the pontifical encyclical.

Because there is a religious division in such a Catholic city, must it renounce its Catholic profession, as a city, and accept a public norm of religious *neutrality*, of *respect for consciences*? Evidently, in no way and in no case, it answers the universal doctrine of the Holy Church; the State must profess the Catholic cult, and consequently, it must conform the civil legislation to the canonical legislation of the Holy Church, and in consideration of the religious division, it may *tolerate*, but only tolerate false cults, that is, allow them as an evil - not as a right - according to that word of St. Augustine, *tolerantia quae dicitur non est nisi in malis*²¹¹ .

In truth," says Leo XIII²¹² , "although the Church judges that it is not lawful for the various kinds and forms of divine worship to enjoy the same right that belongs to the true religion, she does not condemn those in charge of the government of States, who, either to achieve some important good or to avoid some grave evil, tolerate in practice the existence of such worship in the

²¹⁰ Letter to Cgo. Perez, p. 41.

²¹¹ *Enarratio in Ps. 32, Patrol. Migne 36, 271.*

²¹² *Immortale Dei.*

State. The Church also takes great care that no one should be forced against his will to embrace the faith, since, as St. Augustine wisely teaches, *man cannot believe unless he wants to*.

Well, Maritain and Lamennais do not put things this way and in a *confused* distinction of "civil tolerance" and "dogmatic tolerance" they establish in the State a true dogmatic tolerance or freedom of cults, which constitutes a religious indifferentism or practical atheism according to Leo XIII's *Libertas*.

An enormous crime, because if individuals are obliged to profess the true religion, how can the State be exempt from it, which is nothing but man amplified by association, erected at the summit of the community and as carrying, with the union of the forces of all, to the highest degree the power of man? How could the State, a public entity on which depends, in large part, the publicity of worship, the public observation of festivals and public demonstrations of worship, be exempted from the profession of religion? And certainly, since the days of the Revolution, we have become so accustomed that this order of the city in which God is worshipped without the participation of the public power seems normal to us. From where also in many the prejudice has taken hold that religion is an individual thing, a private thing, to be hidden in the secrets of conscience or certainly to be carefully enclosed in the narrow walls of the temples. As if God were not worthy to be honored in the light of the sun; as if Christ had not said: *Preach above the roofs*, and also, *Whoever is ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he shall come in his majesty before the Father and the holy angels*. Moreover, because great is the authority of the State in the people, according to that true saying of the poet: *The whole world behaves after the example of the king; the versatile vulgar always moves together with the prince*.

All is well, Maritain will say. I do not deny it, I have defended it in my *Primauté du Spirituel*. I seek "in what particular way the principles taught in these Encyclicals are called to be *applied* in the concrete circumstances of tomorrow's world"²¹³. "The solutions which I understand the

²¹³ Letter to Cgo. Pérez, p. 41.

new period in which we are entering are in the perspective of the "civil tolerance" admitted by the pontifical encyclicals"²¹⁴ . That Maritain defended this doctrine in his *Primauté* and in *Pourquoi Rome a parlé* and in *Clairvoyance de Rome* against *Action Française*, is quite true. But that he no longer defends it is also true. It does not recognize as the first and inescapable obligation of the State to worship the true God and to subordinate itself intrinsically to the Church. It is false, therefore, that its solutions are in the perspective of the "civil tolerance" admitted by the pontifical encyclicals. Because the pontifical encyclicals accept a Christian State that, without renouncing its profession of Christianity and subordinating itself, therefore, intrinsically to the Church, *tolerates*, that is, permits as a lesser evil, false cults. In Maritain's new city, on the other hand, there is no such profession of Catholic faith, no intrinsic subordination to the Church; and secondly, there is neither true *tolerance*, that is, simple permission of false cults as a lesser evil, but their recognition as a good in itself, as a "respect for consciences"²¹⁵ , as an "acquired gain"²¹⁶ , as a *natural right* of the human person²¹⁷ .

What can there be in common between the teaching of the Church which, through the mouth of Leo XIII, says: "justice forbids . . . that the State should be on an *equal footing with* respect to the various religions they call religions and grant promiscuously equal rights to all"²¹⁸ and that of Maritain who advocates the famous *pluralism* "which assures *on the basis of equal rights*, the liberties proper to the various religious families. . . .?"²¹⁹ .

It is useless for Maritain to invoke that his society would not be neutral but Christian because "*conscious of its doctrine and its morals, it would be conscious of the faith that inspires it and would express it publicly*", because we already know what this "*Christianity*" means.²²⁰ because we already know what this "Christianity" means by virtue of internal forces developed within the peoples and emanating from it, by virtue of the abnegation and self-giving of men who would place themselves at the service of the common work and whose moral authority would be the same as the Christianity of the people.

²¹⁴ Ibid.

²¹⁵ *Du Régime Temporel*, p. 75.

²¹⁶ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 185.

²¹⁷ *Les Droits*, p. 103; English ed. p. 128.

²¹⁸ *Libertas*.

²¹⁹ *Les Droits*, p. 42; English ed. p. 51ff.

²²⁰ *Les Droits*, p. 40; English ed., p. 49.

would be freely accepted, by virtue of institutions, customs and habits such a society could be called Christian not in its appearances but in its substance". This "Christianity" is that famous and impious "Christianity" of the Revolution, distinct from "Christianity as a religious creed and a path to eternal life", "Christianity", which "acts in this way, sometimes taking heretical forms or even forms of revolt"²²¹ . So certain is this "Christianity" and not the supernatural and divine Christianity of the Holy Church that Maritain, in order to explain how its "public expression" would be, writes²²² : "In fact, it is clear that for a given people, this public expression of the common faith would preferably take the forms of the *Christian confession to which the history and traditions of this people* are most vitally linked". Then, there would result a "Christianity" which, by Maritain's confession, "would take the forms of the Christian Confession of a given people", i.e. schismatic, or Anglican, or Presbyterian, or Calvinist, or Baptist, or Methodist.

The reader should note in the paragraph transcribed here that the place granted to the Church in the city would be that which she conquers "*by virtue of the internal forces developed in the bosom of the people and emanating from them*"; so that it will not depend on the divine Will but on the popular will, and in particular, as the popular will depends on journalistic propaganda and journalistic propaganda on the resolutions of the international lodges, it follows that the place granted to the Church in the new Christendom will be at the mercy of the anti-Christian sects.

It is also worth noting the constant and dangerous contradiction from which the new Christianity suffers. On the one hand, Maritain feigns a Christianity, on the basis of "civil tolerance" in response to the modern fact of religious division, which he repeatedly deplores²²³ , and on the other hand, he speaks of a Christianity for the maturity reached by the human person, as opposed to the infancy of medieval peoples²²⁴ . The new Christianity that he projects for this third and mature age of humanity is linked to the progress of humanity to which he refers especially where he makes his own the opinion of the celebrated paleontologist Teilhard de Chardin when he says that Humanity is still

²²¹ *Christ. et Dém.* p. 43; English ed. p. 49.

²²² *Les Droits*, p. 40; English ed., p. 49.

²²³ *Du Régime Temporel*, p. 74 and *passim*.

²²⁴ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 166 ff.

"very young"; and it shows that the evolution of Humanity must be looked upon as the continuation of the evolution of life, in which *progress* means *ascension of consciousness* and in which the *ascension of consciousness* is linked to a higher degree of organization²²⁵ .

In Maritain's logic, his new Christianity should verify the concept of Christianity even more fully than the medieval one. To think otherwise and to maintain that in the highest stages of its development Humanity is dispensed from recognizing and practicing the *divine* rights of the Holy Church would imply falling into the error of the vulgar who affirm that religion is good for children and women, a principle of exquisite impiety, outside of which there cannot exist another more intolerable and injurious; The principle of pure and corrupt atheism, because either God does not exist, or if He does exist, He is the one under whom those who support the world bow down, and He is the one whom the dominations adore and before whom the powers tremble²²⁶ .

Then it does not appear, as Maritain justifies, "the application of a Catholic doctrine diminished to a regime of tolerance" in a Christianity that must be more perfect than the medieval one.

The Church in common law

To disregard the divinity of the Church in the city implies renewing the secular thesis of liberalism held by the Catholics of the last century, which assumed the defense of the rights of the Church in the common law. It was Lamennais who first raised this practice of the Catholics of Ireland and Belgium to the level of theory.

From its first issue, October 16, 1830, *L' Avenir* invites all Catholics to place themselves on the ground of the common law, indicated then by the Constitutional Charter of 1830. "The Charter, he writes, is the shining and faithful mirror in which our society of the nineteenth century, with its opinions so

²²⁵ *Les Droits*, p. 44; English ed., p. 56.

²²⁶Billot, *De Ecclesia*, II, p. 86.

The Charter is true because it recognizes in law what exists in fact, because it says what "is". The Charter is true because it recognizes in law what exists in fact, because it says what "is". ...On the other hand, it is the only possible and durable system, given the division of spirits. The divine social system founded on the free obedience of reason to an immutable law recognized by all "is visibly impossible" since belief in the universally recognized divine law and in the authority that promulgates and infallibly interprets this law has disappeared." "On the other hand, "the brutal system founded on forced obedience to a man whose reason constitutes truth and whose will constitutes justice, "violates" at the same time the right of God and the right of man. . . There remains then the system 'founded on human reason alone' individual liberty 'equal for all, entire for all'"²²⁷ .

Can the Church accept this program which does not recognize her divine rights and which makes the rights to be granted to her derive from the will of man?

The famous Cardinal Pie, who was in the mid-nineteenth century the great fighter for the divine rights of the Church against the heresy of naturalism and liberalism and who was to be one of the greatest luminaries of the Vatican Council, being Vicar General of Chartres in 1848, expounds the right principles on this point.

The governments of societies," he says, "are with respect to the Church in three situations: 1) enemies, and here is the Church under the sword of Nero or Robespierre; 2) allies, and here she is leaning on the scepter of Theodosius or Charlemagne; 3) foreigners, and here she is in front of the Belgian or American Constitution. Now, the cause of our confusion lies in the fact that our French society, a mixture of all these elements, is facing the Church: enemy, by the revolutionary spirit that animates its laws; ally by its antecedents, and by the fact of the concordats; stranger by its political constitution and its most recent constitutional charter".

Which of these three situations is to be preferred? Doctrinally speaking, the *alliance* is the social ideal. "A power that wants to fulfill its duty towards

²²⁷ *Collected Works of Lamennais*, II, p. 424.

God, a power that would propose to resolve its case of conscience, must necessarily protect the truth and can only grant tolerance to dissenting sects". This is the law, this is the right, this is the only admissible thesis without which a vital and truly Christian society cannot exist.

"But, in the *fact* omitting the present regime to fulfill its duty to the Church, is it forbidden to the latter, to avail itself of the resources which its constitution allows it to draw from a bad order of things?"

Far from it. In this hypothesis, the Church will adapt. Not having the protection to which it is entitled, it will at least claim freedom. And if, in view of the present dispositions of the spirits, the regime of the common law serves it more usefully than that of protection, it would be one more reason to accommodate itself, for lack of anything better, to this state of things.

But even then it must be understood that this state, which is often the only one possible because it is the only one accepted, even if it were accidentally more advantageous, is not the normal state. It may be a necessity; not a progress, a happiness, a perfection.

"A legislation," he says, "which professes indifference is a lamentable thing in a Christian people. We must tend with all our desires to a more perfect law. But who can change the law? Only he who has made it. Who has made this law virtually atheistic? The public spirit. Let us, therefore, remake the spirit before we make the law. Finally, who will bring the public spirit back to the Gospel? Religious education... But under what title to ask again for religious education? Under the title of the duty that governments have to contribute to the spiritual health of the people. But this right and this duty run the risk of not being understood; then, under this reservation, one can invoke the promise of freedom inscribed in the Charter. Thus one finds oneself practically brought into the common law, but without abandoning in principle anything of the proper and imprescriptible right of the Church"²²⁸.

²²⁸ Baunard, *Historie du Cardinal Pie*, I, pp. 185-187.

This was not the understanding of the liberal Catholics whose position can be characterized by that of Abbé J. Morel: "The liberal Catholic is one who, for the sake of the Church, prefers common law to canon law"²²⁹ .

The Church, which in particular cases has never ceased to invoke the common law against the State, warns in the famous *Letter of Leo XIII to the French*: "Indeed, to wish the State to separate itself from the Church would be to wish, as a logical consequence, that the Church be reduced to the freedom to live according to the common law of all citizens"²³⁰ .

Although Maritain is careful not to mention the "common law regime" applied to the Church in the legislation of the States, as he hastens to point out in his answer to Canon Arturo Perez of Santiago de Chile, nevertheless, the "thing" designated by the term, appears in his new Christianity.

From the moment that a State does not inscribe as a fundamental law of its public life the recognition of the Divinity of the Church, the rights that it recognizes for the Church or its members do not arise by virtue of Divine Authority, but in response to "the duty of every State to recognize the right of every individual to the free exercise, both public and private, of every faith, religion and belief, the practice of which is not incompatible with public order and good morals"²³¹ .

It is of no use for Maritain to be indignant that "his honor as a Catholic philosopher is called into question" and to affirm that his book *"Les Droits"* was written for the French and in view of the problems that France will have to face after the present war"²³² ; because in it he does nothing but explain his theory, which is so dear to him, of the *cit  pluraliste*: "So that a Christian city, under the conditions of modern times, could only be a Christian city within which the infidels live like the faithful and share in the same temporal common good"²³³ .

²²⁹ *Somme contre le catholicisme liberal*.

²³⁰ *Au milieu des sollicitudes*, 16.II.1892.

²³¹ *Les Droits*, p. 103; English ed. p. 128.

²³² *Ibid*.

²³³ *Humanisme Int gral*, p. 179.

In the chapter *A vitally Christian Society*, it is said that "in the state of evolution and self-awareness to which modern societies have arrived, a social or political discrimination in favor of the Church" ...and far from helping, would compromise and harm its spiritual mission" "...because political society has more perfectly differentiated its proper sphere and temporal object and actually groups together in its temporal common good men belonging to different religious families, it has become necessary that on the temporal plane the principles of equality of rights should apply to these different families"²³⁴ .

"It is a pluralistic conception, ensuring on the basis of equal rights of the various religious families institutionally recognized..."²³⁵ . "It is not in a privileged situation, but in a Christian equal right inspired by its own spirit, and in a Christian equal equity"²³⁶ .

Today, then, because of the *evolution of modern societies* - and consequently *divine law* must be adjusted to what the evolution of man dictates - the Church must be placed, within the civil city, in the common law.

Lamennais did not otherwise set out the problem. And the reader can read in advance this chapter of the *vitally Christian society* in the article of June 30, 1831, published in *L'Avenir*:

"How will the priest possess political privileges when there will be no political privileges for anyone? Citizen of his country with the same title as the others, what more to ask, what more to wish for? But he will still have a great, magnificent privilege, the privilege of abnegation, the privilege of sacrifice..."²³⁷ .

Maritain for his part will write: "No is not by granting the Church a favored treatment, and seeking to tie her with temporal advantages paid with the price of

²³⁴ P. 41; Cast. ed., p. 45.

²³⁵ Ibid., p. 42.

²³⁶ Ibid., p. 43.

²³⁷ *Collected Works of Lamennais*, II, p. 466.

The way the State would help it more in its spiritual mission is by asking more of it - by asking its priests to go to the masses, to join in their life, to pour into them the leaven of the Gospel, and to open the treasures of the liturgy to the world of work and its feasts, and asking their religious orders to cooperate in the work of social assistance, of education of the civil community, and their lay militants and their youth organizations to help the moral work of the nation and to develop in social life the sense of freedom and fraternity"²³⁸ .

This *odious* way of presenting the problem, typical of the impious hypocrisy of the enemies of Religion, has been current among Catholic liberals since the time of Lamennais. It is evident that the Church when she claims recognition of her divine rights does not demand "favored treatment" and much less does she demand for her ministers a "privileged social and political situation" which is outside the milieu of an epoch. It demands only the conformation of individual, family, professional, social and political life to the norms of the Church herself, contained in Canon Law and explained by the magisterium of the Roman Pontiffs. That the education of youth be carried out in a Christian manner, according to the *Divini illius Magistri* of Pío XI; that marriage and the family conform to the *Casti Connubii*; that the problems of labor and the economic order conform to the teachings of *Rerum Novarum*, *Quadragesimo Anno* and *Mater et Magistra*; that the law and the public life of peoples be developed in harmony with the great directives enunciated in the *Syllabus*, *Immortale Dei*, *Libertas*, *Quas Primas* and other teachings of the ecclesiastical Magisterium.

These rights claimed by the Church are simply the rights of the truth *necessary* for the eternal and temporal happiness of men. And since the Catholic priesthood is their authentic depository, its recognition will also entail the place of social pre-eminence which must correspond to it in the Christian city. For if the city is to conform itself to the teachings whose custody God has entrusted to the priest, how can it be prevented from occupying the first place in it?²³⁹ .

²³⁸ *Les Droits*, p. 43; English ed., p. 51.

²³⁹ St. Thomas, *De Regimine principum*, book I, chap. 14 and 15.

by divine right, it will be by the journalist, or by the international financier or some other agent of social dissolution.

But what? After having banished the Church from the life of the peoples and having finally erected a new society on the enlightenment principles of Freemasonry - human person, liberty, equality, fraternity - mobilized, seduced and alienated by social forces of dubious origin and tenebrous means -The result is a subhuman city that normally segregates thousands of human individuals in whom the personal dignity of the rational creature can hardly be recognized, and then comes to the Church, in a train of *apostolic anguish*, so that its priests, as individuals, throw themselves into the midst of the masses, to pour out upon them the evangelical leaven. If it were not too tragic, it would be necessary to point out the laughable aspect of the "Christian" liberal utopia.

No. Peoples are not saved by *apostolic action* in the midst of social waste while the rest of society is corrupted by the ideas and customs with which it is poisoned by international plutocratic interests. The peoples are saved by the Catholic Truth preached freely and, since man awakens to the use of reason, and preached individually and socially; the peoples are saved by *social norms of life*, that is, by *legislation* conformed to the Church. This is the *privilege* that the Church claims to save societies poisoned by the harmful preaching of the Revolution. And does the new Christianity grant the Church these divine rights?

Maritain, in a bitter exposition of such delicate points, adds: "The Catholic Church insists on the principle that truth must have precedence over error and that the true religion, when it is known, must be helped in its spiritual mission in preference to religions whose message is more or less faint and where error is mixed with the truth...." and immediately adds: "it would be very false to conclude from this that this principle can only be applied by claiming for the true religion the favors of an absolutist power or the help of the dragonads or that the Catholic Church claims from modern societies the privileges it enjoyed in a sacral civilization such as that of the Middle Ages".

In the first place, the Catholic Church does not and cannot teach that truth is to be preferred to error; she teaches simply that religious Truth must inescapably be professed and error must inescapably be rejected and excluded with the necessary punishment of the perverse unless purely practical reasons make it advisable to tolerate error, which can never invoke authentic rights.

Secondly, the obligation of the State towards the Church does not derive from the Church's need to be helped by the State as if God had to be helped by man. The necessity arises first from the absolute rights of God and secondly from the indigence of the State which needs it for the fulfillment of its end and to fulfill its civilizing mission.

In the third place, it is not true, as is insinuated therein, that there is an invincible impossibility of knowing the true religion. Against private and public agnosticism Leo XIII teaches: "Since it is therefore necessary for the State to profess a religion, it must profess the one true religion, which is known without difficulty, especially among Catholic peoples, since in it the characteristics of truth appear as if stamped.

Fourth, the Church *does not claim privileges but rights*.

The notion of privilege which implies that of favor, of particular law, cannot be used without doing injury to the Holy Church which has imprescriptible rights. The *accidental* way of recognizing these rights in the Middle Ages, or in the Renaissance age, is irrelevant. What is important and fundamental is that these rights be fully and faithfully recognized.

Nor does it cease to be hostile what is written there about "the favors of an absolutist power or the help of the dragonads". The Church never demanded an imprudent and police help for the performance of its mission, and if the princes have committed abuses, it is not necessary to emphasize them so hatefully as to want to invalidate the recognition of just rights. Nor is the injurious expression for all Christian rulers (insinuated here and made explicit in the above-quoted paragraph "seeking to bind them with temporal advantages *paid* with the price of their freedom") to whom is ascribed the

Pharisaical intention to serve the Church in order to enslave her, but above all it is injurious to the Church when it is insinuated that for temporal advantages she could sell her freedom.

In the fifth place Maritain claims that in his New Christianity different spiritual or religious families are on *an equal footing* with the Catholic Church, and he alleges for this *equal* treatment the fact that political society has more perfectly differentiated its own sphere²⁴⁰. But what new Christianity is this? What could be more absurd, in the same terms, to speak of a Christian society, a Christianity, that grants equal rights to Christians and non-Christians? What equal rights? To vote, to trade, to have fun? And what is the point? The fundamental thing, which is the right to impose the *form of life* that should prevail in the city, to whom will it correspond? What form of life will prevail? Christian, socialist, Calvinist or Judaic? What will be the legislation, the teaching, the family, the customs? Catholic, socialist or atheist? And if the Catholic way of life prevails, as the essence of Christianity demands, how can one speak of equal rights? Whom are they trying to deceive with such erroneous language? Catholics or anti-Catholics?

Separation of Church and State

Maritain never uses the expression "*separation of Church and State*"; he even defends himself from being accused of this thesis. "Monsignor Luis Arturo Perez denounces me as a supporter of the equality of cults and religions, of religious indifferentism, of the separation of Church and State, and of the thesis of theological liberalism regarding the relations of Church and State. It bothers me to have to say that these assertions are simply false. I have spent my life fighting the errors of theological liberalism".

But Lamennais, who in his articles in *L' Avenir* defended only the animating theses of the "new Christianity" and who had previously defended the most intransigent Catholic position in his *Essay on Religious Indifference*, could as rightfully if not logically make Maritain's angry words his own.

²⁴⁰ *Les Droits*, p. 41; English ed., p. 49.

In an article in *L'Avenir* appearing on October 18, 1830, under the name *Separation of Church and State*, Lamennais clearly states his point of view:

"Naturally," he begins, "religious and civil society, Church and State, are therefore inseparable; they must be united like body and soul: here is the order. He then goes on to the hypothesis:

"But it may happen that, beliefs being divided, several spiritual societies are formed in the same State, in a certain way; and from then on, the State, not being able to identify itself with any of them without breaking with the others and treating them as enemies, it follows, in the first place, that each of them tending, so to speak, to constitute itself externally to make in the State another State, the war of beliefs or opinions becomes a permanent political and civil war, and, in the second place, that each opinion or each belief prevailing, now one, now another, ends by being successively oppressed. Replacing force to discussion, instead of enlightening it, it irritates it; passions are exalted, it is no longer heard; anarchy becomes interminable.

"The remedy, the only remedy to so great an evil, is to let this spiritual war go on and end with purely spiritual weapons. Truth is all-powerful. What most retards its triumph is the support that material force tries to lend it, it is the very appearance of violence in the essentially free domain of conscience and reason: it is the brutal violence that violates and profanes the sanctuary of the soul where God alone has the right to penetrate. No one must render an account of his faith to human power, and the contrary maxim, directly opposed to Catholicism, the basis of which it ruins, has never produced, whenever it has been seen to appear in the world, but bloody divisions, calamities and crimes without number, has evoked from hell the Dukes of Alba and the Henry VIII.

"And to speak first of the State, in what relations can the government place itself with respect to the Church? Evidently it is necessary either to protect it or to oppress it: there is no middle ground.

"If it protects it, it will immediately arouse against itself an opposition similar to that which has contributed so powerfully to overthrow the ancient power... if it oppresses it... such an attempt will arouse at once the immense body of Catholics and all those who, without being Catholics, sincerely love liberty.

"...Let us consider, on the other hand, what would be in the present circumstances, which will not change for a long time, the situation of the Church, supposing that it retained its ties with the State.... Dependent on power, if it resigns itself to suffer its domination, if it yields to its influences, obeys its orders or is only suspected of obeying them, all political opposition will become religious opposition; we will see what we have seen: the priest debased in opinion, the perpetual object of the distrust and animosity of the parties, will be represented as the venal instrument of the administration, as the fautor of despotism and the natural support of tyranny; he will be accused of servility, intrigue, avarice, human ambition. He will dare, on the contrary, to resist power and its prescriptions, even when his conscience obliges him to do so more closely, the maxims of the Gospel and the canons of the Church impose it on him as a rigorous duty; listen to these voices that rise up and attract with loud cries the public animosity and the violence of authority on the rebel, the fanatic, the man of disturbance and disorder who refuses to submit to the laws.

"...Catholics, let us understand it well, we have to save our faith and we will save it by freedom..."

This thesis -as such- is contained, as for the "thing" but as for the "name" in Maritain. For a city, conceived for the *coming of age of peoples*, which does not worship in its public life the God of the Catholic Church, which recognizes as a natural right the *respect of consciences*, that is to say, which does not admit that its public life directs the citizen towards Catholic Truth, which perverts the notion of "Christianity" by separating it from the Church, which does not recognize the latter except in a regime equal to that of other spiritual families, which does not admit, as we shall see later, that the State, in what is essential to it, which is the public force of law, be placed at the service of the ends of the Church, is a State separated from the Church. And so separated from the Church that the place which corresponds to the Church is occupied by another

kind of spiritual community, not the Church, but the State.

but philosophical-liberal in whose service he certainly admits the public force of the law to be placed. Indeed, Maritain writes²⁴¹ : "But the democratic community should defend itself against him, whether he be materialist, idealist, agnostic, Christian or Jew, Muslim or Buddhist, by keeping him away from the leadership, through the power of a strong and well-informed public opinion and should even hand him over to justice when his activity endangers the security of the State".

Finally, let us not fail to point out here also the incongruity of Maritain in pretending on the one hand a more perfect Christianity for the times of maturity of humanity and on the other hand a diminished Christianity, inasmuch as it is deprived of the cooperation of the State in the repression of heresies. Does the *curtailment* of the *ministerial* character of the State arise because men have in fact learned to fulfill their duties towards the Church, so that it is not necessary to have recourse to the coercive aid of the State; or, on the contrary, because peoples *untolerant* of the supernatural make it impossible to have recourse to this coercive ministry? But undoubtedly it is not for the first reason. For, *"wilt thou not fear anything from him that hath the power? Then do well; and you will deserve praise from him. For the prince is a minister of God appointed for your good. But if you do evil, tremble; for he does not in vain gird himself with the sword, being as he is a minister of God, to exercise his justice in punishing the evildoer."*²⁴² .

As if we were to say that if in the next and third Christendom the coercive power of the State is not to be used for the purposes of the Church because the peoples will behave so judiciously that the use of this power will become unnecessary, then it is not necessary to invent the theory of a new Christendom founded precisely on the fact of religious division and the indocility of the peoples to supernatural Truth.

²⁴¹ *The foundations of democracy*, in *El Pueblo*, of Buenos Aires, May 13, 1945.

²⁴² Rom., XIII, 3.

Assessment of medieval Christianity

The naturalism that presides over Maritain's thought in the elaboration of his new Christianity will appear more clearly if possible in the evaluation he formulates of the *sacral Christian conception of the Holy Empire's temporal dimension*. To appreciate this assessment in all its meaning, let us note, as Maritain himself expressly points out, that he does not speak of the Holy Empire as a "historical fact; strictly speaking, it could be said that this fact did not achieve true existence"²⁴³. Lamennais already said that "this system, under a certain aspect so brilliant, never marched but with difficulty and could never develop completely"²⁴⁴; nor does he speak of the Holy Empire as a *theocratic utopia*; "we speak of the Holy Empire as a concrete historical ideal or as a historical myth, that is to say, as a lyrical image that orients and moves a civilization. Thus considered, it is necessary to say that the Middle Ages lived on the ideal of the Holy Empire (and died from it): if this myth is understood in a sufficiently broad way, in all its representative and symbolic value, it ideally governs all medieval temporal forms and the very conflicts, the antinomial realizations that have prevented the *sacrum imperium* from truly existing as a fact"²⁴⁵.

In what does Maritain place the typical characters of this *sacral Christian conception of the temporal*? "In the first place it is the tendency to a qualitatively maximum organic unity"²⁴⁶ which "asks to center the unity of the temporal city as high as possible in the life of the person, in other words, to found it on *spiritual unity*.... ". But the temporal unity of Christian Europe did not have its source only in religious unity... it also entailed, and this was indispensable since it was a question of a maximum temporal unity, the powerful unity, although very general and compatible with the sharpest particular divisions and rivalries, of a certain common background of thought and doctrinal principles.... "an imperial unity superordinate to the various kingdoms as the unity of wisdom is superordinate to the different species of

²⁴³ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 156.

²⁴⁴ *Collected Works of Lamennais*, II, p. 465.

²⁴⁵ *Collected Works of Lamennais*, p. 156.

²⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

sciences: the supranational political center of Christendom was the Germanic Roman Emperor""²⁴⁷.

From this high sacral unity derives "the predominance of the *ministerial* role of the temporal with respect to the spiritual"²⁴⁸; of the temporal not as an intermediary or infravalent end but as a "simple means, of *instrumental cause*, with respect to eternal life", as demonstrated by the notion of the secular arm, the name of "bishop of external jurisdiction" given to kings, or typical events such as the crusades"²⁴⁹. Correlatively with this ministerial function of the city derived the third characteristic feature which consisted in "the use of the means proper to the temporal and political order (visible and external means where social cohibitions play a great role, cohibitions of opinion, cohibitions of coercion, etc.), the use of the institutional apparatus of the State for the spiritual good of men and for the spiritual unity of the social body itself..."²⁵⁰. The fourth note of the medieval historical ideal was constituted by a "certain disparity as of essence (between the leader and the led), I mean a certain disparity of essential, hereditary categories or.... a diversity of *social races*"²⁵¹. The fifth *and* last note of the historical ideal of the Middle Ages concerns the common work in which the city works, and which consisted then in the establishment of a juridical social structure placed at the service of the Redeemer by the force of baptized man and baptized politics"²⁵².

Such is the historical ideal of the medieval society exposed by Maritain himself. Ideal that as Lamennais also said²⁵³ could and was good, but that has no *permanent value*. Well; of the five notes that Maritain assigns to the medieval historical ideal; the truly central and decisive one is the first one, that is, that the temporal city places its unity in the religious unity of the Catholic Truth and consequently, the State puts itself at the service of this Unity, from which results a Christian city, in which the first thing is the service of God.

²⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 160.

²⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 167.

²⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 162.

²⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 163.

²⁵¹ Ibid., p. 163.

²⁵² Ibid., p. 166.

²⁵³ *Collected Works of Lamennais*, II, p. 463.

The fourth note, that is to say, the diversity of *social races*, is completely *incidental* to the indication of a condition of Christianity; whether or not this diversity of *social races* is lacking, Christianity, as Christianity, will be the same. We will therefore omit its consideration here and study it later.

In his analysis that occupies ten pages²⁵⁴ Maritain classifies as *distinctive* elements of medieval Christianity, constitutive elements of all Christianity, and that consequently if they are missing, it ceases to be a Christian city and becomes naturalistic. The *sacred* or *priestly* or *supernatural* arises from the very essence of the Christian city, which is, in substance, nothing other than a city that recognizes as the *ultimate end of human life* the supernatural destiny that can only be achieved in the Church. If man was created for eternal salvation and if he cannot be saved except by belonging to the Church, it follows that the earthly city must be at the service of the Church. Therefore, a society that wishes to respect the essential nature of man, as it is constituted in the present order of providence, can only be *sacred*, *priestly* or "*supernatural*".

Let us suppose in fact a city of Christians who want to proceed fully according to the faith. This city is made up of Christian men who are diversified by diverse occupations that all conspire to the common usefulness. Those engaged in economic tasks, those in cultural, those in political, those in religious. If these citizens want to proceed as Christians in the development of their *temporal* activities, that is to say in those that are *directly* ordered to their earthly happiness, as are the totality of economic, cultural and political activities, they have to execute them in such a way that, in them at the same time, they conquer supernatural happiness.

That is to say that when these Christian men carry out economic, cultural and political actions, they have to carry them out to save their souls; because they have to achieve supernatural beatitude with their earthly actions, practiced supernaturally, sanctified by the theological virtue of charity. Otherwise these actions would be sterile for eternal life..... And not being ordered to that end which is due in the present providence, they would lack an end, and consequently would be *simpliciter evil*, considering the demands that the actions of Christians should have. Therefore, if Christians proceed

²⁵⁴ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 156 ff.

As such, in their individual, family, economic, cultural, civil, and political relations, all temporal life becomes supernaturalized and therefore has God, One and Triune, as its ultimate end, and recognizes the kingship of the Word made Flesh, and as for the supernatural actions that are carried out in it, they will be under the jurisdiction of the Church, the sole depositary of this order. The rulers, whatever the political regime of the city, will conform even their temporal actions as rulers to this ultimate end, and will consequently place public power at the service of this end, as the constant teaching of the ecclesiastical Magisterium inculcates.

What is to result from a city of Christians who proceed in this way in *a Christian manner*, that is, supernaturally? That of all the goods available in this world, the first place must be given to the supernatural goods of the Holy Religion of Jesus Christ; that all other goods, without depriving them of their proper order, without depriving them of their economic, cultural, political nature and quality, on the contrary, seeking to perfect them in their proper order so that they may be more conveniently ordered, must be ordered as means, to the acquisition of their supernatural perfection.

Well, this and nothing else is, in substance, the Middle Ages. But this essential order of a Christian city is valid for any epoch of history, because it derives from the very nature of Christian activity. That then the Christian city of the Christian Roman Empire of St. Augustine, or of the Frankish kingdom of Clovis, or of the empire of Charlemagne may differ from one another because of individual differences arising from accidental historical circumstances cannot affect this essential order, which will always be that which will shine with maximum splendor in the Middle Ages, remaining the *perpetual law* of the Church.

It is surprising that Maritain, who invokes St. Thomas as the inspirer and architect of his new Christianity, has not noticed the irrefragable demonstration made by this Doctor in chapter XIV of book I of the *Regiment of Princes* when he writes: "The end of the associated multitude is to live virtuously, since men unite in civil community, in order to obtain from it protection to live well, and to live well for man, is nothing else than to live according to virtue. But this end cannot be absolutely

the last; since man, having an immortal soul, is destined for eternal bliss, and society, instituted for the benefit of man, cannot dispense with that which is his supreme good. It is not, then, the ultimate end of human life to live a virtuous life, but to arrive by a life of virtue at everlasting happiness. Now he who guides and leads to the attainment of eternal bliss is none other than Jesus Christ, who entrusted this care here on earth, not to secular princes, but to the Priesthood instituted by Him, and principally to the Roman Pontiff, all the civil rulers of the Christian people must be subordinate; for to him to whom belongs the care of the ultimate end, those to whom belongs the care of the proximate or intermediate ends must be subordinate".

St. Thomas did not recognize this order as valid for the Middle Ages but for the whole Christian epoch. And if Maritain's opinion that the Angelic Doctor has his mission of *architect of the future and new Christianity* is accurate, these are the principles on which it must be founded, principles diametrically opposed to those of the *Humanisme Intégral*. An opposition as fundamental as the one reflected in this extraordinary paragraph of *the Regiment of Princes*:

For this reason," says St. Thomas admirably, "it was arranged by Divine Providence, that in the city of Rome, foreseen by God as the principal seat of the Christian people, the custom was introduced little by little that the rectors of the cities should be subject to the priests. For as Valerius Maximus says: "Our city has always affirmed that everything must be postponed to religion, even those things in which the splendor of high majesty shines. Therefore, they did not hesitate to *place the command at the service of the sacred*, because they considered the regime of human things to be firm, if they were well and solidly placed at the service of the divine power. And because it was also to happen that in France the religion of the Christian priesthood would take great increase, it was provided by God that, among the Gauls, *the pagan priests, whom they called Druids, fixed the law of all Gaul* - as Julius Caesar refers - in the book he wrote of the war of Gaul"" (L. I, 14).

Maritain himself in his *Primauté du Spirituel* recognized this supernatural, sacred and priestly character of the Christian city, when he wrote²⁵⁵ :

"This right of the city of God over the earthly city is postulated by the earthly city itself by virtue of an internal requirement. It is in fact ordered to a temporal common good which is not only of a material order, but also and principally of a moral order; the good human life (virtuous life) of the multitude assembled in a social body, comunicatio in bene vivendo (De Regimine Princ., I, 15). Now then; the upright human life here below presupposes the ordering of man to his ultimate end, which is supernatural and cannot be obtained except through Christ; the good of the city must be ordered to this same supernatural ultimate end which is that of each individual man..... the rule of conduct of individual and social life not being able to make abstraction from the supernatural order, and to speak properly, a complete political wisdom being from the sphere of theology, the prince, to fulfill his office, must himself be instructed in these sciences and consult those who have the deposit. Thus St. Louis consulted St. Thomas. "The king," wrote the latter, "must procure the good life, here below, of the multitude, insofar as it is conducive to the attainment of celestial happiness, so that he may prescribe those things which lead to this happiness and prohibit, as far as possible, those things which are contrary to it. What is the way that leads to true happiness and the obstacles that oppose it, he knows from the divine law, the teaching of which is proper to the priestly ministry" (De Reg. Princ., I, 15).

The Christian temporal city must therefore be "supernatural" as opposed to naturalistic; "supernatural" because of the *supreme end* to which it is indirectly ordered, which is Jesus Christ, God-man, author and consummator of the order of Revelation and Grace; "supernatural" because of *its proximate end*, which is to promote the virtuous life in relation to the supernatural end of the multitude gathered in its bosom; "supernatural" because of *its formal cause*, that is, because of the conformation it is to impose on human activities, which are to be super-elevated and supernaturalized according to the supreme end; "supernatural" because it is to arise through the common effort of human, economic, cultural and political agents under the supreme direction of the supernatural priesthood.

²⁵⁵ *Primauté du Spirituel*, p. 25.

So fully has Maritain understood this "supernatural" character of the Christian city, and so unabatedly has he expounded it in *Primauté*, that he writes: "To show this subordination of the temporal to the spiritual, which he compares to the subordination of the body to the soul, St. Thomas, we have just seen, bases himself on the very subordination of ends, which requires that the authority which moves toward the supreme end should direct, either by its teachings, or by advice, or, if necessary, by orders, those whom it moves toward the intermediate end, and that under the law of Christ kings should be subject to the Sovereign Pontiff. Let us notice that under this point of view the indirect power is considered in a very universal way, as embracing not only the particular interventions of the Church, by express counsels or orders, *ratione peccati*, but also the directing influence exercised over temporal things by her own general teaching and by the education which she gives to the nations. A temporal sovereignty thus formed in spirit, a truly Christian city, would of itself go to Christian ends, and to this free movement would come to be added to perfect it the special interventions of the Church, whose motherhood never ceases to shelter the peoples. In this way, in the normal conditions of civilization, that is to say, if the peoples and the rulers were what they should be, the indirect power would be verified as naturally, by the spontaneous docility to the evangelical law and to the general teaching of the Church, and, when the latter judges it opportune, to her particular counsels".

This is the transparent conception of Christianity of Catholic theology, expounded by St. Thomas, imperfectly realized as everything human by the Christian centuries and valid as a condition of health in the future and that Maritain did not dare to alter when he "wanted to work for God and not for modern society"²⁵⁶.

²⁵⁶ *Antimoderne*, p. 217.

The myth of strength in the service of God

Maritain wanted to characterize the medieval ideal of life with the "myth of strength at the service of God" as opposed to the ideal of the new Christianity summarized in the "myth of the realization of freedom".

The adoption of such an uncharitable expression is surprising. Is it perhaps intended to arouse in the modern reader the image of the police power - the *dragonnades* - at the service of the clergy to coerce wills in the fulfillment of religious purposes? The image may be effective, but it does not show how the serenity of the philosopher and the prestige and dignity of "*Christian Europe* which, guided and blessed by the Church, retaining the variety of nations, arrived at a unity that fostered prosperity and greatness"²⁵⁷.

But if one wants to be objective and to point out the *instrumentality of public power for the purposes of the Church*, which was so magnificently verified in the Middle Ages, one must not forget that it derives from duties essential to every truly human society. We have seen above that, even in the order of pure nature, a *normal city* must include a hierarchy made up of the wise, the politician and the multitude engaged in the multiple services of life. The sage, in the true sense, is he who has come to conform his life to Truth and who, consequently, has surpassed the domain of law, justice and virtue. The wise man, liberated by the contemplation of Truth, will not selfishly shut himself up in sterile solitude, but will communicate to others the truth and virtue which he has attained. His action will descend directly upon the members of the multitude, inculcating in them, *by persuasion*, virtue, and it will descend also, and in a very special way, upon the Politician, who, taught by the Sage, will then apply, in his domain, which is that of the *external and temporal* activity of the city, those rules of reason which are to regulate the life of the citizens. The law is the great instrument of the Politician and it is "an ordering of reason for the good of the community by the one who takes care of it". With the law the Politician effectively applies to the multitude the Truth he learned from the Sage. His task is properly *practical*, of prudence, just as that of the Sage is properly *speculative*.

²⁵⁷ Benedict XV, in *Pacem Dei Munus*.

But the efficacy of the law derives from its coercive power, because as St. Thomas teaches²⁵⁸ : "The law induces to be obeyed by the fear of punishment; and, as for this is placed, as an effect of the law, the punishment". Punishment that has the effect of "accustoming one to avoid evil and to fulfill the good, for fear of the penalty in order to fulfill it of one's own free will"²⁵⁹ . It is clear that this is a secondary and instrumental effect of the law, ordered to the primary effect; "it is manifest," says St. Thomas, "that what is proper to the law is to induce those for whom it is promulgated to their own virtue. And since virtue makes good those who have it, it follows that the proper effect of the law is to make good those to whom it is given". But coerciveness is essential to it.

This is the basis of the *instrumentality* of politics and, therefore, its intrinsic subordination to the good that is the object of the wise man's contemplation. Such a civilization cannot have as its law of life the primacy of the political because this would be to the detriment of wisdom.

Maritain has seen well this *secondary* character of politics and this domain of *imperfection* in which it necessarily moves, but, in an eagerness to underline its limitations, he has failed to emphasize the *perfection* that comes with its very *instrumental* character which, by making it serve the ends of the wise man, makes it participate in his excellences.

Political society is imperfect precisely because it has to reduce to perfection, by *coercive* means, a multitude which resists perfection, that is, which only through *fear* of the laws enters the path of its own good. If men were to come into this world wise or perfect, or, at least, with an unfailing and incorruptible yearning for perfection, so that they were actualized in their perfection by the magisterium of persuasion or indoctrination, without the need for coercive inducements, political society would lose its character of *coercion and violence* and would become a contemplative society. That is to say, political society, as politics, would lose its *raison d'être*. There would be society, yes, with hierarchies, but without the apparatus of force that, by necessity and for the good of men, political society must have in the present condition of things.

²⁵⁹ Ibid., ad. 4.

²⁵⁸ I, II, 42, 2.

²⁵⁹ Ibid., ad. 4.

This ideal society, made up of the perfect, would be an amicable "*convivium*" in which each and every one, despite individual inequalities of dispositions and interests, would occupy the place that would correspond to them most conveniently with respect to the very perfection of the amicable and contemplative city. In it the communication of goods, both material and spiritual, would be established *automatically*, that is, by the spontaneous initiative of each and every one. Whatever the possibility of this ideal society may be, what is certain is that in the present condition of man, who comes *destitute* of all truth and good and in *need* of mutual and common assistance to acquire his arduous and progressive perfection, as regards his material, moral and intellectual condition, it would be a dangerous and disastrous *dream*. In the present condition of man, political society is *necessary* as a *force for the promotion of virtue*.

And since that mission which would correspond to the wise man in an ideal society of pure nature, in the present providence is more than fulfilled by the Church - divine Contemplative - it follows that civil society must place itself at his service; and that civil *legislation*, that is, the coercive force of the city, must be ordered to the ends of the Church itself, "namely - as St. Thomas says²⁶⁰ - to order those things which lead to the heavenly welfare and prohibit those things contrary to it, as far as possible".

If human life is to be sacred or supernatural, as we have shown, all other inferior ends must be subordinated to the sacred, since secondary goods have reason to be means with respect to superior goods, and it is necessary that the means be conditioned to the ends.

Although the lower end is a means to the higher end, this does not imply that it is *merely an instrumental* cause... it can be a true principal cause; it can have action without the ultimate cause; but if it is to be *Christian*, it must subordinate itself, as a means, to the end of the supreme cause. Civilization, profane life, can exist without the Church; but if it is Christian civilization, that is, if it takes as its supreme norm of life the commandment of the love of God, it must submit itself totally to the Church; sacred formality must constitute its supreme form.

²⁶⁰ *Of the Regiment of the Princes*, I, 15.

St. Thomas, invoked by Maritain as the architect of his "new Christianity" understood it this way when he asks himself in Article VIII of the Tenth Question of II. II of the Summa Theologica if the infidels must be compelled to the faith and answers:

"I answer that some infidels never received the faith, as the Gentiles and Jews, and these such are by no means to be compelled to the faith to believe, for to believe is proper to the will; *yet they are to be compelled by the faithful, if power is available (si adsit facultas) so that they do not put obstacles to the faith either by blasphemies or by evil persuasions or by open persecutions. And for this reason the faithful of Christ wage war against the infidels*". (Maritain, who mentions the crusades as a typical medieval historical act, has he had this text in mind?) "Not, certainly, to force them to believe because if they were defeated and held captive they would leave it to their freedom to believe, but *so that they do not impede the faith of Christ*. The other infidels who received the faith and profess it, such as heretics and some apostates, are to be compelled even corporeally to fulfill what they promised and to sustain what they once received."

For this same reason, theologians teach that the State not only "must not establish nor do anything against revealed religion"²⁶¹, but "must defend it in the temporal order, indirectly, by prohibiting what is offensive"²⁶² and must even "positively and directly, foster it not only by favoring the preaching and propagation of the true faith... but publicly by the public profession of the faith".... Thus Constantine wished to call himself "episcopus ad extra"; and Charlemagne "devoted defender of the Holy Church and her humble auxiliary"²⁶³.

This is but the constant teaching of the Holy Church that Gregory of Loyola XVI recalls Lamennais when in the *Mirari Vos* he writes: "Finally, let the princes help these our desires for the good success of sacred and profane things by their power and authority, for they received it not only

²⁶¹ Garrigou-Lagrange, *De Revelatione*, p. 624.

²⁶² Ibid.

²⁶³ Ibid., p. 625.

for the temporary government , but also for defense y
custody of the Church"²⁶⁴ .

And as Christian life has declined in the public life of formerly Christian peoples, the Church has not ceased to invoke the need for public force, although, as life has changed, the field in which it could be employed has varied. Just as in the Middle Ages the Church invited the Christian nations to fight in the Crusades, and at the time of the Reformation, she invoked public power to combat heresy, and Gregory XVI, Pius IX and Leo XIII reminded the States of their obligations to restrain the license of life, Pius XI, in *Divini Redemptoris* against communism, reminds us that "to this same spiritual undertaking of the Church the Christian State must positively assist the Church in her endeavor with the means proper to her, means which, although external, are also primarily related to the good of souls".

But let it be noted that the point of application of the *ministerial power* of the State *has changed*, not in law, but in fact. Today, as in the middle ages, politics must be placed at the service of the Christian life of the city, even if, because of the malice of impiety, it cannot fulfill this obligation. And as life *must* be sacred if it wants to respect its essential condition, *sacred* reasons can be those that force to take up arms, in given occasions, as the Spanish people did in the glorious deed of 36 against the atheistic communism; reasons as sacred as those that determined to move war against the infidels in full Christianity²⁶⁵ .

The aid of material force in the service of the sacred, under the conditions explained, cannot be lacking in a Christian civilization. Insofar as it is lacking, there is no Christianity. For if political power, whatever its condition, monarchical, aristocratic or democratic, does not place itself at the service of spiritual values, the deposit of which is in the Church, it will place itself at the service of itself (State absolutism, whether totalitarian or democratic, the words are irrelevant, the realities are what count) or of money (plutocracy) or of the

²⁶⁴ *Quanta Cura*, by Pius IX, and *Libertas e Immortale Dei*, by Leo XIII.

²⁶⁵ See Julio Meinvielle, *Qué saldrá de la España que sangra*, in which Maritain's position on "holy war" is criticized.

plebs (democratic license). Let us not forget that political power -force- which is consubstantial to any political regime, cannot but *serve*. The problem does not arise between serving and not serving, but between serving one or the other end of life. It serves the Church, that is to say the increase of authentic spiritual perfection of the people or it serves the development of a life centered on the exaltation of the Race or of the Nation as in the Germany of the Third Reich, or it stimulates a mercantile life as that of conservative pre-war England or, finally, it serves a materialistic conception of life that will be able to assume many styles as that of the secularist France or that of the naturalist United States or that of the atheist Russia. But the State cannot cease to serve anyone because, otherwise, it would cease to exist. If it exists it acts and if it acts it does so by developing a *way of life*, which is ordered to the Church or ordered against the Church. There *is* no *neutrality*. Here the Savior's saying: *Whoever is not with me is against me*, and the other: *No one can serve two masters*.

On the other hand, by the very fact that the public power does not place itself at the service of the Holy Church, it oppresses her. For if it is not Christian, that is, if it is not at the service of the Church, the form which the public power, with its power of coercion, tends to give to the profane substance of life, it follows that this profane substance, independent of the Church, will be constituted as an end in itself, and by its mere act of presence will displace the Church from that influence which belongs to her in the life of Christians; the Church will inevitably be oppressed and persecuted. This is what happens in modern societies, a typical example of which is the United States. There the Church is not oppressed *directly*... but the *impulse of life*, whether derived from public opinion or from the force of the State, develops a substance of social and public life, pagan, acatolic, which stifles and suffocates the Christian life. The cold persecution is terrible for the Truth that lacks the means to reach the faithful in the face of the temporal power that has all the resources to brutalize the people.

Catholic liberalism, which from Lamennais to Maritain reduces the field of the State to "the temporal" as if it did not have to employ its power in the service of spiritual ends, necessarily perverts the very notion of the State. The State is an *external* and *temporal* entity. External in the sense that its peculiar sphere of action commands the external actions of men and regulates and

protects the exercise of his rights; temporary in that it ends with time and regulates the obligations and rights of man for this temporary life.

But these rights and obligations, manifested in the *external* and *temporal*, are *spiritual* or have connections with the *spiritual*. The State is properly an external and temporal agent, endowed with material force, but *an agent of the spiritual* because it has as its proximate end the virtuous life and as its indirect ultimate end eternal life. Therefore, the *ministeriality of the State with respect to the spiritual* is involved in the very notion of the State. If the State omits it, the State becomes laicized, naturalized and corrupt. The necessarily ministerial character of the State at the service of spiritual ends is so evident that Maritain, who on the one hand rejects the ministeriality of the force of the State at the service of the Church and wants the State to collaborate with the Church "according to the mode" of "evangelical love"²⁶⁶, that is, in a way that is not conditioned by the coercive nature of the State; on the other hand, he, philosopher "*de la purification des moyens*"²⁶⁷ appeals to any rigor of the coercive force of the State, "must defend himself with particular energy against those who refuse on principle and who work to destroy the foundations of common life, of such a regime which are freedom and cooperation, mutual civic respect"²⁶⁸. Maritain then, who is scandalized by the use of force in the service of the true perfection of man, demands the use of this same force to build his naturalistic city of universal tolerance.

The *naturalism* of Maritain's "new Christianity" cannot be concealed. A city that does not worship the One-trine God of Christian Revelation; that establishes as the supreme norm of its action the respect of consciences and the recognition of the inviolable natural right of every human person to worship God in his own form in any part of the world; that reduces the Church, Ark of Health of the human race to the common right to the Synagogue, to heretical cults, infidels and atheistic unbelief; which separates the Church herself from the temporal life of individuals, families and peoples; which repudiates the sacred character of public life and refuses the ministerial force of the State to serve the spiritual ends of the Church, is a naturalistic State and therefore atheistic in

²⁶⁶ *Du régime*, p. 78.

²⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 164-225.

²⁶⁸ *Les Droits*, p. 113; English ed. p. 138.

open opposition with the magisterial teaching of Leo XIII who in *Libertas* says: "Justice, therefore, forbids and reason also forbids that the State should be atheistic, or what amounts to atheism, that it should be on an equal footing with respect to the various so-called religions and grant promiscuously equal rights to all".

The naturalism of impiety has infiltrated and corrupted the Maritainian city according to what the Vatican Council says: "By the fact that this impiety has spread everywhere, it has unfortunately happened that even many children of the Catholic Church have strayed from the path of true piety and the Catholic sense has been diminished in them with a gradual diminution of the truths. For dragged along by various and pilgrim doctrines, making a bad mixture of nature and grace, of human science and divine faith, it turns out as the facts show that they have depraved the genuine sense of the dogmas and endanger the integrity and sincerity of the faith"²⁶⁹ .

²⁶⁹ Constitution *Unigenitus Dei Filius*.

THE NEW CHRISTENDOM, CITY OF FRATERNITY UNIVERSAL

*"No one works for the Church,
one works for humanity". (Pius X in
The Chair).*

We asked ourselves in the previous study if the *"evangelical fraternity,"* the "myth" that directs the Maritainian city, would constitute its supreme end or only a subordinate end close to it. Does that city," we said, "which proposes "evangelical fraternal friendship" as its end, adore the true God and his Son Jesus Christ, or does it not adore him? Does that city place the love and glory of God at its summit, as its first orienting Truth, so that with respect to it and to the *extent that it leads to it, it accepts* evangelical fraternal friendship, or on the other hand, does this fraternal friendship constitute its first and supreme truth, to which everything must be accommodated? It depends on the solution of this alternative whether that city is Catholic or whether it is, on the other hand, the city of universal tolerance. For if fraternity were a means that would be sought only insofar as it would bring men closer to God; that is, if tolerance were practiced only insofar as the rights of God and of the Church were not diminished, that city could be called Catholic. But if, on the contrary, this fraternity, and therefore this tolerance, were to regulate everything in the city to the point that the rights of God and of the Holy Church were ordered - that is, sacrificed - to it, such a city, with its evangelical fraternity, would be an impious, profoundly anti-Christian city. With the study of this problem we complete the analysis of the naturalism of Maritain's new Christianity.

Religious diversity in modern societies

Maritain seeks the solution to a problem, unfortunately very real, that modern societies pose, namely that of religious diversity in the modern world.

within the same civilization²⁷⁰. This was also the problem that moved Lamennais to elaborate his liberalism of *the future*.

"Imagine," writes Lamennais, "a house inhabited, on its different floors, by a Jew, a Moslem, a Protestant, a Catholic; certainly their beliefs and the duties resulting from them are too opposite for there to be real society. But let them fear lest madmen come and set fire to the house whose roof covers them all, or lest, at every triumph of a different party, they come and successively slit their throats, or persecute them as Jew, Moslem, Protestant, Catholic, the common danger will unite them. And unless they are blinded by a fierce fanaticism, they will not hesitate to associate for their mutual defense, an association that will create between them relations of benevolence, which will make them easier, calmer and more effective the purely doctrinal discussions on the points that divide them. In any case, they will have lived, and lived in peace"²⁷¹.

The posing of the problem is perfectly legitimate as is the question Maritain asks himself in the article *Qui est mon prochain*, published in his book *Principes d'une politique humaniste* about "whether the diversity of religious beliefs, which is an obvious historical fact, should be regarded as an insurmountable obstacle to human cooperation"²⁷². There is no doubt that it must be seen as a very great obstacle, but there is no doubt also that it must be overcome. But any task of overcoming it must not be carried out at the expense of Truth, but on the contrary, bearing in mind that it alone, the root and foundation of true charity, unites, and that without it, what is intended to unite is a muddy mixture that confuses and perverts everything.

Since every *human society*, and even more so politics, its most perfect expression, groups men together for an exchange of *goods*, whose value and hierarchy must be measured in relation to an end, it is not possible to establish a true and *formal cooperation* between men who do not accept the same end of life. Strictly speaking, a society thus *divided* by religious beliefs cannot be *a society* - as Lamennais already insinuated -; there will necessarily be several societies as there are several conceptions of life, several goals,

²⁷⁰ *Du régime*, p. 73.

²⁷¹ *L'Avenir*, 30/X/1830, in *Collected Works of Lamennais*, II, p. 423.

²⁷² *Principes d'une politique humaniste*, p. 137.

around which life is centered. The notion of God, which shapes all life, may sound the *same* to the ear but it must be terribly equivocal.... If there are many gods, one the supernatural god of the Catholic, another the heretic, another the Jew, another the idolater, there must also *be* many *philosophies of life*, many and diverse *social-political philosophies*. Then there cannot be true and formal *cooperation*. Then there cannot be true and formal coexistence and cooperation, according to that definition of people given by St. Augustine when he says: "The people is a congregation of many persons, united among themselves with the communion and conformity of the objects that they love"²⁷³ .

Consequently, the only Catholic solution to this problem, the only one that does not sacrifice the Truth, is the one proposed by Leo XIII in *Immortale Dei*, when he teaches that the State, without having to renounce the public profession of the Catholic faith, nor authorize that "*the various kinds and forms of divine worship enjoy the same right that belongs to the true religion*," can, in order to avoid some grave evil, "tolerate in practice the existence of these cults in the State" . In the Catholic solution to this problem, the constitutive norm of the Christian city continues to be the same norm of the Christian State, namely, the State subordinated to the Church, the concord of the priesthood and the empire.

Maritain's solution is quite different. Maritain substitutes for this norm a very different one, namely, that "minimal unity, which places its center of formation and organization in the life of the human person, but not at the highest level of the latter's supra-temporal interests, but at the level of the temporal plane itself"²⁷⁴ .

Maritain thus lowers the point of *unity* on which the members of the city must agree. On what concrete basis will this unity, centered on the level of the temporal plane itself, be established? In his *Humanisme Intégral* he has not sufficiently clarified the point. On the one hand, he speaks of a "*temporal or cultural unity*" that "does not in itself require unity of faith and can be Christian even if it includes non-Christians"²⁷⁵ ; on the other hand, *he speaks of a "temporal or cultural unity" that "does not in itself require unity of faith and can be Christian even if it includes non-Christians"*; on the other, he speaks of a

²⁷³ *The City of God*, 1. XIX, c. 24.

²⁷⁴ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 177.

²⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 177.

"ethical and ultimately religious specification"²⁷⁶ with "Christian impregnation"²⁷⁷ , "a unity of orientation, proceeding from a common aspiration (traversing heterogeneous layers of culture of which some may be very deficient) towards the common way of life the most in accordance with the supra-temporal interests of the person"²⁷⁸ , "a simple unity of friendship"²⁷⁹ .

What Maritain proposes there does not appear clear and does not even allow to be conveniently imagined. For, in effect, how can "a temporal or cultural unity" be established without *dependence* on the very end of human life, which is God, "a temporal or cultural unity" that encloses in its intrinsic construction human values, insofar as they are human? And if a culture or a complete temporal life cannot be structured *independently* of God, how could a *unity of culture* or a *complete temporal life* result if there is no unity with respect to God? And how can there be *unity* with respect to God when one holds such diverse and opposing beliefs?

On the one hand, it is not perceived how "this temporal or cultural unity" should be imagined and, on the other hand, it is clearly perceived that Maritain teaches something very different from what he maintained when he refuted the political naturalism of *l'Action Française*. At that time, back in 1926-1929, Maritain was particularly careful to stress the need for the supernatural life of the Church, even in temporal life, as a remedy for the deep evils that afflict nations. In fact," he wrote²⁸⁰ , "and in the conditions of present life, it is *impossible* (Maritain stresses), and this is the constant teaching of the Sovereign Pontiffs, for order and peace to reign in the nations if Christian virtues, justice and charity are not restored in them. It is *impossible* without Christ to lead an upright human life, both in political and social life and in individual life. It is *impossible* for politics to be truly good, for the human city to be organized and conducted for the true prosperity of the multitude, if this politics and this city are not directed by Christian principles". Christian principles were then inescapably demanded as "guiding principles" of the city, and certainly not "Christian principles" of a

²⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 178.

²⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 173, in note.

²⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 173.

²⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 178.

²⁸⁰ *Clairvoyance de Rome (Avec collaboration...)* Ed. Spes, Paris, p. 256.

"Christianity" as "leaven of the social and political life of peoples and as bearer of the temporal hope of men", different from "Christianity as a religious creed and a path to eternal life" which can take "heretical forms or even forms of revolt".²⁸¹ but from the only Christianity that he recognized at the time and to which he clearly alluded when he quoted the words of Benedict XV: "In the midst of the present upheavals, it is important to repeat to men that the Church is, by divine institution, the only ark of salvation for mankind.... *Thus it is more opportune than ever to teach that the liberating truth for individuals as for society is supernatural truth, in all its fullness and purity, without attenuation or diminution, and without compromise, just, in a word, as Our Lord Jesus Christ came to bring it into the world, just as He entrusted its custody and teaching to Peter and to the Church*"²⁸², and then he also recalled these magnificent words of the *Quas Primas* of Pius XI: "The private good and the common good have the same source: *There is no salvation in another and there is no other name under heaven given to men, by which we must be saved.* Citizens and States have the same principle of prosperity and authentic happiness: *the city has its happiness from no other source than man, since the city no is but a multitude of men living in concord*".

At that time, the *norms* that should preside over the Christian city were *supernatural*, as he admirably exposes in chapter V of the same book, entitled *Nature and Grace*. The Christian city was structured for Christians, to serve as a means for them on their way to eternal life. "For this reason the temporal common good is subordinated to the supernatural ultimate end (and therefore civil society to the Church)"²⁸³. Non-Christians should, consequently, try to fit into that society, grateful to be given hospitality and to be *tolerated* with their false cults and with their errors; they could never claim rights for their dissent, much less invoke them to alter the *Christian norm of coexistence* that must regulate the very life of the temporal city. It was not, therefore, the *norm of social life* that was to accommodate the false cults, but the false cults which, if *tolerated*, were to avoid being a cause of disturbance to Christian society.

²⁸¹ *Christ. et Dém.* p. 43; English ed. p. 49.

²⁸² Quoted in *Clairvoyance de Rome*, p. 258.

²⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 242.

A common basic naturalistic faith

But when Maritain invents his new Christianity he begins by establishing as a premise that "political society has more strongly differentiated its proper sphere and its temporal object, and in fact unites in its temporal common good men belonging to different religious families"²⁸⁴ . As if *the fact* or the existence of heretics constituted a *right* that demanded the renunciation of the constitutive norm of a Catholic city, as if God and the Church had to lose their rights because the impiety and contumacy of the impious became arrogant; as if the *ritus infidelium sunt tolerandi*, which St. Thomas established with the whole ecclesiastical tradition in the middle of the Middle Ages, were the fixing of a new *directive norm of social life* accommodated to the infidels, Maritain pretends to draw as a consequence that "it has become necessary that on the temporal plane the principle of equality of rights be applied to these different families", and then adds a reason that seems to him decisive: "There is but one temporal common good, that of political society, just as there is but one supernatural common good, that of the Kingdom of God, which is suprapolitical. To introduce into political society *a particular common good* which would be *the temporal common good of the faithful of one religion, even if it were the true one*, would be to introduce for them a privileged situation in the State, would be to introduce a *principle of division into political society and thus to fail in the temporal common good*"²⁸⁵ . And since to establish a *Catholic norm of civil coexistence* would be to assign a temporal common good, proper to the Christian faithful, which could not be accepted by Buddhists, Shintoists, schismatics, Protestants, rationalists and atheists... (because, if they do not believe in the Holy Church...), how can they be compelled to accept the *public morality* standard of the Church?); then this temporal city, this new "pluralist" Christianity, must renounce the *Catholic norm of coexistence*, in order not to hurt the feelings of non-Catholics, and must adopt a *common norm of coexistence* -syncretistic, based on indifference and religious freedom- *common* to believers and non-believers. In this new position, Maritain, forgetting the ardor with which he was indignant before the naturalism of *Pujo*, who accused him of "*mettre le spirituel dans le matériel*"²⁸⁶ , affirms very loosely that the "supernatural faith does not point us to any system".

²⁸⁴ *Les Droits*, p. 41; English ed., p. 50.

²⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 42; English ed., p. 50.

²⁸⁶ *Clairvoyance de Rome*, p. 238.

social or political system"²⁸⁷ . And what was that "Christian politics", *positively* oriented to the supernatural end in which man is placed in the present providence, defended against *l'Action Française*, if not a social and political system regulated by the demands of supernatural faith?

But now, in this "liberalizing" position of his, the supernatural end of all human life and therefore supernatural politics must be forgotten and the way must be found in which "men belonging to the most different philosophical or religious creeds can and should cooperate in the common task, for the common welfare of the community, founding their agreement on the basic principles of a society of free men"²⁸⁸ .

So his new Christianity is not now based on the norm of the traditional principles of the Christian state, but on basic principles resulting from an agreement between Catholics, Protestants, schismatics, infidels and atheists; so that "the first principle of all true social order, God and the Church, first in the city"²⁸⁹ is subordinated to what, in an agreement, the pluriform inhabitants of the fraternal city want to grant them. Hence he recently wrote: "No society can live without a common basic inspiration and faith, but the most important thing to note here is that this faith and this inspiration, this philosophy and this self-concept that democracy needs, *all this does not per se belong to the order of a religious creed or of eternal life*, but to a temporal or secular order of earthly life, culture and civilization".

How far all this is from what Maritain wrote²⁹⁰ : "It is normal for the Church to be vigilant that the political formation received by her children does not sacrifice these truths. *These essential truths, these properly Christian truths* M. Pujo and *l'Action Française*, in whose name he speaks, deny them outright when they are scandalized that after having observed that in the "*Action Française*" the same temporal good of the nation is proposed to Catholics and atheists, *apart* from any ordination, the same temporal good of the nation is proposed to Catholics and atheists.

²⁸⁷ *El Pueblo*, of Buenos Aires, dated 13/V/1945.

²⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁸⁹ *Pourquoi Rome a parlé (Avec collaboration...)* Ed. Spes, Paris, p. 200.

²⁹⁰ *Clairvoyance de Rome*, p. 235.

to the supernatural ultimate end -(P. R., 181)- we added: "As if the temporal end of the city were intrinsically unmodified, whether or not it was ordered to the eternal life of souls. As if to this common good, to which a totally empirical investigation would fix once and for all the immutable conditions, could or could not be added later, in a completely optional and superogatory way, the ordering of the city to the ultimate end of all human life, the recognition of the supernatural order and of the sovereign rights of the Redeemer, as if, in short, the elevation to the supernatural order, without destroying our nature or changing it, in its essence, did not really and intrinsically elevate it, did not modify its powers, its conditions and its measures"".

Thus, against *Action Française*, the temporal common good had to be intrinsically raised to the supernatural; the *norm of life of the Christian city* was not simply natural but *supernaturally elevated*, and now "*this basic common faith*" without which "*no society can live*", "*does not belong of itself to the order of a religious creed or of eternal life, but to a temporal or secular order of earthly life, of culture and of civilization*". Then, against the *Action Française*, Maritain's great scandal because "*the same temporal good of the nation is proposed to Catholics and atheists, apart from any ordination to the ultimate supernatural end*", and now, without the slightest hint of astonishment, a "faith", an "inspiration", a "philosophy", a "concept" of democracy is proposed in which "materialists, idealists, agnostics, Christians and Jews, Muslims and Buddhists" "can agree". Either this philosophy of democracy includes an intrinsic ordering of the temporal common good to the supernatural end or it does not. If it does, how can materialists, idealists, agnostics, Christians and Jews, Muslims and Buddhists agree with it? Y
How can it be a "*common basic faith*"? Do materialists then accept, in their practical life, "the recognition of the supernatural order and the sovereign rights of the Redeemer"? Do they accept the primacy of the supernatural public moral of the Church?

It is quite evident that Maritain knows, more than enough, the transcendence of the supernatural order proposed by the Church and knows, more than enough, the arrogant attachment with which heretics adhere to the figments of their imagination so that he can think that the supernatural order is included in a "common faith" of "men who have very different and even opposite religious or metaphysical points of view". Those "basic principles" about

which believers and non-believers *have agreed upon* cannot, in all certainty, include an intrinsic supernatural ordination, cannot include the recognition of the supernatural order and of the sovereign rights of the Redeemer. This is why Maritain himself wrote²⁹¹ : "It is impossible, on the other hand, that the science and political prudence of a Christian be the *same* as the science and political prudence of a pagan (even supposing, which is not the case with M. Maurras, that he knows God by reason). Only the Christian is capable of a science and a political prudence truly adapted to the government of fallen and rescued men". And no one imagines that a *common basis* could be constituted on which all could practically agree, and that Catholics would then complete it on their part, elevating it supernaturally. For as Maritain warned there²⁹² "the principles of a science and the supreme rules of a virtue are not like portions of an extended whole, like an arm of a statue or a village church in which a place can be left free while reserving to complete one day the whole that awaits them and that is built without them. These principles and rules are like vital centers without whose integrity, a living organism cannot be born and grow as it should. Now, the principles and the supreme rules of human acts are not completely known and as a Christian must know them if *Christian truths are ignored*: all practical science and all the direction of human life, in particular of *political life*, will be falsified from the origin, if these Christian truths are ignored".

Consequently, if those principles of *practical science* that Maritain upheld with so much emphasis have not lost their value -and they will not lose their value until Maritain proves otherwise-, we must conclude that the "common basis" of the democratic philosophy that regulates the human coexistence of believers and non-believers excludes any intrinsic ordering of the temporal common good to the supernatural end. Consequently, it is an unacceptable common basis for the Catholic who has the right to demand "that the structure of the city, the political order itself, be in conformity with the laws of God, of Christ, of the

²⁹¹ Ibid., p. 230.

²⁹² Ibid., p. 231.

Gospel precepts, to the immutable moral rules laid down by God for the preservation, dignity and wise direction of human life"²⁹³ .

And here we have a new demonstration that Maritain's new Christianity *is essentially naturalistic*. The common basis of democracy is irremediably naturalistic, and when Maritain speaks of "Christian" leaven, we already know what he means by it. A "Christianity" that is not that of the Holy Church of Jesus Christ; a "Christianity" that pretends to be *something else*, more universal than the Church, in which the latter enters as collaborator with "men belonging to the most different philosophical or religious creeds ... in the midst of the *convivium* of spiritual families, which however diverse they may be, will work together, on the level of the city, for the common temporal good of a civilization truly respectful of the dignity of the human person"²⁹⁴ .

In all truth then, Maritain's new Christianity renews the attempt of the *Sillon*, so energetically condemned by Pius X.

"There was a time when the *Sillon*, as such, was formally Catholic. Knowing no other moral force than the Catholic, he proclaimed that democracy would be Catholic or it would not be. But a moment came when, changing his mind, he left to each his religion or his philosophy and even he himself ceased to call himself a Catholic, substituting his formula: "Democracy will be Catholic" with this other one: "Democracy will not be anti-Catholic", not even anti-Jewish or anti-Buddhist. This was the time of the *greatest Sillon*. Summoned for the construction of the future city all the workers of all religions and all sects, *no other demands were made of them than to embrace the same social ideal, to respect all beliefs and to contribute some portion of moral forces*. It is true that it was said: "The leaders of the *Sillon* put their religious faith above all things". But can they take away from others the right to draw moral energy from wherever they can? In return, they want others to respect in them the right to draw it from their religious faith. Therefore they ask all those who want to transform the present society in a democratic way not to repel each other because of their philosophical or religious convictions.

²⁹³ Ibid., p. 252.

²⁹⁴ *Questions de conscience*, Desclée de Brouwer, Paris, p. 265.

that can separate them, but that they go hand in hand, not renouncing their convictions, but trying in the field of practical realities the proof of the excellence of their personal convictions. Perhaps, in this field of emulation between souls belonging to different religious or philosophical schools, union can be achieved".

Maritain, forgetting now that the life of man, both individual and social, both religious and temporal, have one and the same end, and consequently, one and the same total order, just like the *Sillon*, which gathered in *the greatest Sillon* believers of all denominations and even non-believers as long as they accepted a common democratic faith, summons all the workers of all religions and all sects to build the city of the "*amitié fraternelle*", from which only those who do not accept this *common basic faith* are excluded.

"If we want to consider the question thoroughly," he says, "and are not afraid of words, we should point out here that where there is faith, divine or human, there are also heretics who threaten the unity of the community, whether religious or civil. In a sacred society the heretic breaks religious unity. In a secular society of free men, the heretic is the one who breaks "common democratic beliefs and practices" and totalitarianism is the one who denies freedom - the freedom of his neighbor - and the dignity of the human person and the moral power of the law. We do not wish him to be burned or driven out of the city, or locked up in a concentration camp. But the democratic community should defend itself against him, whether he be materialist, idealist, agnostic, Christian or Jew, Muslim or Buddhist, by keeping him out of the leadership, by the power of a strong and well-informed public opinion, and should even hand him over to justice when his activity endangers the security of the state. But first and foremost, democracy should be defended by strengthening everywhere a philosophy of life, intellectual convictions and constructive work, all of which would render impotent the influence of such heretics"²⁹⁵ .

Thus, in the "new Christianity", whose profane name is the "new democracy"²⁹⁶ , *the crime* that would merit fulminant excommunication would be the

²⁹⁵ *El Pueblo*, of Buenos Aires, dated 13/V/1945.

²⁹⁶ *Messages* (1941-1944), Ed. de la Maison Française, New York, 1945, p. 88.

denial of the "libertarian" freedom of the human person; and the Catholic who defended the *Christian public law* of the *Immortale Dei* of Leo XIII or the *Quas Primas* of Pius XI, should be brought to justice as a violator of the "new" "Christian" public law invented by Maritain.

The Church and the priest are now rightly evicted from the leadership of this "new Christianity" and in opposition to the clear teaching of Pius XI who in *Ad catholici sacerdotii* teaches that only the priest is the depositary of the good news, "*the only one who can preserve, or implant or bring about the revival of true civilization*", the philosopher of the "new Christianity" decrees "that in his projected city the "principal" responsibility will probably depend on a leadership composed of Christian laymen and of the most prepared elements of the working classes"²⁹⁷ and decrees there "that the new French democracy would arise from *the cooperation between the socialists and the Christians*".

And how will this "universal common faith" of the Maritainian city be fabricated?

On what will he rely? Maritain himself asks: "Will he be able to find the

Will the "universal common faith", implied by democracy, its highest source of authority in the scientific method? Will intelligent activity in the field of social projects be sufficient to ensure the integration of culture? In the democratic culture of the future - if it is to have a future - will it be "the teacher dedicated to the scientific spirit" and not the priest who will assume the primary responsibility for nurturing, strengthening and enriching a common faith?" And the saving answer of the architect of the new Christianity is not long in coming: "I think," he says, "that each school must be allowed to affirm its belief fully and integrally" and since the god-freedom is to preside over the construction of this new city only one thing is justly forbidden. But let no one," adds Maritain, "try to impose it by force on others! The responsibility of nourishing, strengthening and enriching the common democratic faith will belong no less to the priest, dedicated to preaching the Gospel, than to the teacher, dedicated to the scientific spirit, if both come to realize clearly the needs of our time and free themselves from the parasitic prejudices inherited from the past."

²⁹⁷ *El Pueblo*, of Buenos Aires, dated 13/V/1945.

So that priests, free "from the parasitic prejudices inherited from the past", must join with socialists, materialists, agnostics, atheists, Jews in a "universal common faith" to discover the *new* principles on which the Maritainian city must rest.

How accurate are those words of Pius X about the *Sillon*, which had the same objective that today excites Maritain. "But stranger still, more frightening and more afflictive at the same time, are the audacity and levity of men who, *calling themselves Catholics, imagine to re-found society in the said conditions and to establish on earth, above the Catholic Church, "the reign of justice and love", with workers coming from all over the world*, of all religions or lack of religion, with or without beliefs, on condition that they forget what divides them, namely their religious and philosophical convictions, and that they put in common what unites them, that is, a *generous idealism* and their moral forces taken wherever they can".

How is it possible - we have the right to ask ourselves - that a philosopher who professes to be a Catholic and who has so splendidly paraded the teachings and directives of the Holy Church in his *Primauté* and other books against *l' Action Française* and who in *Principes d' une pol.*²⁹⁸ , alludes to the Document du *Sillon*, has not had in mind the very serious reflection of Pius X when he writes the following?

"When one thinks of the forces, the science, the supernatural virtues that were necessary for the foundation of the Christian city, the sufferings of millions of martyrs, the lights of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, the abnegation of all the heroes of charity, a powerful hierarchy born in heaven, torrents of divine grace, and all this built, united, permeated by the Life and Spirit of Jesus Christ, the Wisdom of God, the Word made man, when one thinks, we say, of all this, it is frightening to see the new apostles obstinate in doing better with a vague idealism and civic virtues; when one thinks, we say, of all this, it is frightening to see the new apostles obstinate in making things better with a vague idealism and civic virtues. What are they going to produce, what is going to come out of this collaboration? *A purely verbalistic and chimerical construction, where the words of liberty, justice, fraternity and love, of equality and exaltation of man, all founded on a bad human dignity, will be mirrored in a seductive confusion.*

²⁹⁸ *Principes d'une politique humaniste*, p. 68.

understood; a tumultuous agitation, sterile for the proposed end, profitable for the less utopian mass agitators. It can truly be affirmed that the Sillon, by setting its eyes on a chimera, is escorting socialism".

How is it possible that Maritain is so obscured that he fails to see what the Holy Father so clearly observes right there? We fear even worse. The result of this promiscuous collaboration, the beneficiary of this cosmopolitan social action can only be a democracy which will be neither Catholic, nor Protestant, nor Jewish; a *religion* (for Sillonism, as its leaders have said, is a religion) *more universal than the Catholic Church*, and which will bring together all men made in the end brothers and companions in "the kingdom of God." "No you don't work for the Church; you work for humanity".

The fellowship of people of different faiths on the spiritual plane

Maritain, and in this he only follows the path opened by Catholic liberalism, establishes a *strong separation* between the things that refer to the plane of the kingdom of God and those that refer to the plane of earthly life. The problem of companionship between men of diverse beliefs will fix it in consequences in one and the other plane weakening the differences that the diversity of beliefs can found in the spiritual plane and increasing the cooperation that in the temporal plane can be established between men of diverse beliefs or disbeliefs.

Maritain tries to *attenuate* the differences that can separate Catholics from non-Catholics by resorting to "a common *invisible* belonging to Him who vivifies souls by his love. *Visibly*, in the order of the dogmatic affirmations to which we adhere and in which we recognize the Word of God and which we hold to be true and salutary... we are not united but divided..." "The God whom we adore teaches us respect for consciences and the deep brotherhood of men of good will"²⁹⁹ .

²⁹⁹ *Questions de conscience*, pp. 259-260.

And as a consequence of this attenuation of the profound differences that *before God* there must *necessarily* be between a Catholic and an acatholic, and in order to create a propitious leveling of men, notwithstanding the differences that may exist, he resorts to a benevolent term, *fellowship*, to name the relations of good understanding and mutual comprehension that can be established. "The English word *fellowship* is not easy to translate," says³⁰⁰ ; the less bad French equivalent would be fraternal rapprochement or agreement, or, as I said before, companionship. I like this word better, in any case, than tolerance, because it evokes a set of positive - positive and elementary - relationships. It evokes the idea of fellow travelers who incidentally find themselves together down here, walking the roads of the earth, however fundamental their oppositions may be, in good human accord, in good humor and in cordial solidarity".

This spirit of universal comradeship of men, in spite of dogmatic differences, does not appear to be compatible with the Aristotelian-Thomistic teachings that Maritain omits to bring in. Thus the Angelic teaches that "by the sin of infidelity that all heretics commit, the true knowledge of God is not attained"³⁰¹; therefore, the expression "the God whom we adore" is false and impious, as if it were one and the same God, the one adored by Catholics and believers of other confessions. There is *only one way* to reach God, outside of which God is not reached; and outside of which this adorable name is nothing but "*flatus vocis*". "*Without faith it is impossible to please God*," says the Apostle³⁰² , and for this reason we must set "our eyes on Jesus, the author and perfecter of faith"³⁰³ , and since faith is the *root of the whole spiritual foundation*, according to the Tridentine, nothing is to be guarded with so much zeal as faith. Hence the Church is very severe in everything that can weaken the faith of her children. The Angelicus asks: "Whether it is possible to enter into communication with the infidels" and answers: "I answer by saying that communion with certain persons is forbidden to the faithful in two ways: in punishment of the one from whom communion with the faithful is taken away, and in caution of those who are forbidden to communicate with others. And one and the other cause may be drawn from the words of the Apostle. For after

³⁰⁰ *Principes d'une portique humaniste*, p. 138.

³⁰¹ II, II, 10, 3.

³⁰² Hebrews, XI, 6 .

³⁰³ Ibid.

He added as a reason for his sentence of excommunication: "*Do you not know that a little leaven corrupts the whole lump?*" In the first way the Church does not forbid the faithful communion with infidels who have not received the Christian faith, namely with pagans or Jews, because she does not exercise spiritual jurisdiction over them, but only temporal jurisdiction in the case in which, living among Christians, they commit some fault and are punished by the faithful with temporal punishment.

"But in this way, as a penalty, the Church forbids the faithful to communion with those infidels who depart from the faith received or who corrupt the faith, as heretics, or who also totally renounce the faith as apostates; against one and the other the Church pronounces sentence of excommunication. But as to the second way, it is necessary to distinguish according to the different conditions of persons, of affairs, and of times. For if some are firm in the faith, so that from communion with infidels the conversion of infidels can be expected rather than the departure from the faith of the faithful, they are not to be forbidden to communicate with infidels who have not received the faith, namely, with pagans and Jews: especially if necessity urges. *But if they are simple and sick in the faith, whose crisis may be feared with probability, they are to be forbidden to commune with the infidels; and especially not to have great familiarity with them and not to communicate without necessity*"³⁰⁴.

This very serious doctrine of the Angelic Doctor measures what should be the *criterion* that should guide the relations of Catholics with non-Catholics. They are far from being of *companionship*. The reason is founded on the fact that every man must order his life *first and foremost* in the love of God; so that he is to establish his friendships and relations with other men in so far as they lead him to love God, and he is to withdraw from them, in so far as from God they withdraw him. Therefore, sólo can maintain temporal relations, with infidels, insofar as the Catholic faith cannot suffer detriment.

And let it be noted that firmness in the faith does not simply entail *speculative* solidity in the truths of Holy Religion; it also implies rectification of the practical understanding and of the will affirmed in the service and love of God. For experience shows that contact with heretics and unbelievers, *even in Catholic philosophers and theologians*, does not fail to diminish the "Catholic

meaning" of “

³⁰⁴ II II, 10, 9.

these holy truths, as the Vatican Council has observed. So important is this integrity and purity of the faith that St. Thomas, in Article X of the same question, censures and forbids that infidels may acquire authority or dominion over the faithful: "In no way is it to be permitted - he says - because it would yield scandal and danger to the faith; for easily those who are subject to the jurisdiction of others, can be changed by those to whom they are subject, to follow their will" and as to whether Christians can have unfaithful servants or Jews, St. Thomas answers that since "it is more likely that the servant, who is governed by the lord's command, will be converted to the faith of the faithful lord, than the contrary, therefore it is not forbidden for the faithful to have unfaithful servants; but if danger should threaten the lord from such communion with the servant, he should put him away from himself, according to that command of the S e n s e r : *"If thy foot offend thee, pluck it up and cast it far from thee "*"³⁰⁵ .

This doctrine of the Church, proposed by the great theologian St. Thomas, which shows *the primacy* given by the Holy Church to the *integrity of the faith of her children*, had to be recalled also by Maritain to neutralize the deception to which his theories of *fellowship*, of companionship between believers and non-believers, can lead. Especially in times like ours, as Gregory XVI recalled in the *Mirari Vos* to Lamennais: "Another cause that has produced many of the evils that afflict the Church is indifferentism, that is, that perverse theory spread everywhere, thanks to the deceptions of the impious, and which teaches that eternal life can be obtained in any religion, provided that it conforms to the norm of what is right and honest. You can easily discover to your flock such execrable error, the Apostle saying that there is only one God, one faith, one baptism, and let those who think that they are going everywhere to the port of salvation understand, therefore, that, according to the sentence of the Savior, they are against Christ, since they are not with Christ, and that those who do not gather with Christ, scatter miserably, by which those who do not have the Catholic faith and do not keep it whole and undefiled, will infallibly perish; Hear St. Jerome, who says that the Church being divided into three parts by schism, when anyone tried to attract him to his cause, he always said with fortitude: he who is united with the Chair of Peter is mine. Let there be no illusions because they are

³⁰⁵ II, II, 10, 9, ad 3.

To this St. Augustine replies that the branch does not lose its form when it is separated from the vine, but what good is it if it does not live from the root?

These prescriptive teachings of the Holy Church should not be omitted by a Catholic philosopher who seeks, first and foremost, the service of Truth. To omit them is to induce in the reader a disastrous kind of false charity by which, convinced of the obligation to approach non-believers in order to bring them to the faith, he ends up losing or diminishing the precious gift of supernatural faith. Here the doctrine of the Church has its proper place, which teaches, as far as the spiritual good is concerned, that man must, after God, love himself first and more than any other³⁰⁶ .

*Belonging to the soul of the Church*³⁰⁷

No less objectionable is Maritain's exposition of "Catholic doctrine concerning the status of non-Catholics before God"³⁰⁸ . "We think, he says, that no there is salvation outside of the Truth and that the fact that all men do not know it explicitly, the fact of religious division, far from being a good thing in itself, is a sign of the misery of our condition; but we think also, as I have just explained, that the Truth speaks to the heart of all men and God only knows who are those who, born in such a part of the world and placed or not under the regime of His publicly revealed word, hear truly and efficaciously the interior and secret word. We believe that there is no health apart from Christ, but we also believe that Christ has died for all men, and that to all is offered the possibility of believing in Him, explicitly or implicitly. We believe that there is no salvation apart from the mystical body of Christ. But we also believe that those who are visibly incorporated into this body by the profession of faith and of the sacraments, thus appointed to continue in time the work of redemption, and receiving a wider effusion of the means of grace, are not the only ones who

³⁰⁶ II, II, 26, 4.

³⁰⁷ Modern theologians do not speak of belonging to the soul of the Church, but to the body and soul, in *Voto non in re*. (See Lercher, *De Vera Religione*, n. 437).

³⁰⁸ *Principes d'une politique humaniste*, pp. 144ff.

are in him; we think that every man of good faith and upright will, provided he does not sin against the light and does not refuse the grace inwardly offered, belongs, as it is said, to the soul of the Church, or in other words, that he forms part invisibly, and by the movement of his heart, of the visible Church and receives of her life, which is eternal life; without anyone else, whether Christian or not, knowing whether he is worthy of love or hatred"³⁰⁹

.

But we, for our part, have the right to think that all this exposition is not precisely to *shed full light on* the necessity of belonging to the body and soul of the Church; dogma of faith, *de fide catholica definita*, at the Fourth Lateran and Florentine Councils which, as Maritain taught, with the words of Benedict XV, against *l'Action Française* today "in the midst of the current upheavals, must be repeated and taught as never before"³¹⁰ .

It is true that belonging to the body and soul of the Church can be supplied, *in voto*, in desire, when a truly *invincible* ignorance prevents it from being so *in re*, in reality.

But be careful not to be deceived or deceived. For such a one, even without having *visible* bonds of union with the Holy Church, could be saved, not precisely because he does not have such bonds, but in spite of not having them, and because of an excess of divine mercy, in which only he who has done everything in his power to approach and reach God should trust. It is not in vain that the Holy Spirit says: "There are ungodly men who live as calmly and securely as if they had the merits of the just. Cosa that seems to me to be very vain ... "³¹¹

Pius IX, in his allocution *Quanto conficiamur* of August 10, 1863, reacts against this criminal indulgence that is intended to be shown to those who are outside the Holy Church: "Therefore, our beloved Sons and Venerable Brethren, it is fitting that today we mention again to condemn *the very grave error in which some are miserably incurring by thinking that the fact that certain men live in error and are separated from the true faith and from Catholic unity does not prevent them from attaining beatitude*. This sentence is openly

³⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 165.

³¹⁰ *Clairvoyance de Rome*, p. 238.

³¹¹ *Eccles*, VIII, 14.

contrary to Catholic doctrine. Certainly, for Us and for you it is constant, that those affected by *invincible ignorance* about our most holy Religion, if on the other hand they *punctually observe the natural law and its precepts*, carved by God in all hearts, and *if willing to obey Him they lead an honest and upright life*, they can, God, the supreme inspector, scrutinizer, and knower of all minds, all souls, all thoughts, and all acts, would not consent, in his supreme goodness and clemency, that those who are not guilty of voluntary guilt should be punished with eternal torments. But no less notorious is the *Catholic dogma that no one can be saved outside the Catholic Church, and that those who are contumacious against the authority and definitions of the Church itself*, stubbornly separated from its unity and from the Roman Pontiff, successor of Peter, to whom the Savior entrusted the care of the vineyard, cannot attain eternal salvation. On this point the words of Our Lord Jesus Christ are very clear: "If he will not hear the Church, count him as a Gentile or a tax collector. He who hears you hears me; and he who despises you despises me. And he that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me." "He that believeth not shall be damned." "He that believeth not is judged already." "He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth." This class of men, the Apostle Paul calls *"perverted and condemned by their own judgment,"* and the Prince of the Apostles calls them *"false teachers,"* who introduce sects of perdition and deny God, bringing upon themselves hasty ruin."

Theologians teach that no one can be saved without belonging to the Church. The *necessity* of this membership is not purely of precept, that is, because it is ordained, but of *means*, that is, that the very fact of not belonging places us outside the only way provided by God to reach heaven. The dogmatic foundation of this teaching is constituted by the express and definitive word of Jesus Christ when he declared to Nicodemus that "unless one is baptized he cannot enter the kingdom of God"³¹². And nothing makes this person an adult or an infant; guilty or not guilty. If he does not fulfill this condition he cannot be saved. On the other hand, they also teach that the necessity of baptism derives from the fact that it *is the entrance door* to the Church. Therefore, not belonging to the Church necessarily and absolutely means exclusion from the kingdom of heaven. So necessary and absolute that children who die without baptism, through no fault of their own, are not saved.

³¹² John, III, 5.

Consequently, they are not saved. Adults can *replace* the actual reception of the sacrament by *justification*, which cannot be fulfilled without fulfilling certain *absolutely* necessary conditions. These conditions are a supernatural act of *love of God*, but a supernatural act that presupposes as a foundation, also absolutely necessary and irreplaceable, *supernatural faith* with the *explicitness* of at least two articles, namely, that God exists and that he is the rewarder of those who truly seek him, according to that of St. Paul in his *Letter to the Hebrews* (XI, 6): "*For without faith it is impossible to please God. For he who comes to God must believe that God exists and that he is the rewarder of those who seek him*".

Thus, no man who has died before the use of reason can be saved unless he is baptized; nor can he be saved once he has reached the use of reason unless he believes, by an *explicit* act of supernatural faith, in God the rewarding God, and by virtue of this act is ready to fulfill all that God requires for salvation. Hence, the adult can be saved precisely because, by virtue of this explicit act of faith, he has the *virtual* intention of uniting himself to the Church, inasmuch as he is ready to fulfill the conditions demanded by God, one of which is this visible belonging to the Holy Church.

The gravity of this doctrine cannot be disguised and diminished as Maritain does, when he speaks that "*there is no salvation outside the Truth*", as if it were enough to adhere to some truth or to some thing that seems true to us. No. Supernatural adherence is necessary, not to *abstract Truth*, but to the *subsistent Truth*, distinct from created things, which is God, and the God who has spoken to man.

The bona fide atheist and the resources of grace

That Maritain's exposition is aimed at sowing confusion in such a delicate matter is confirmed, if there could be any doubt, by the case of the *bona fide atheist and the resources of grace* that he proposes in his *Humanisme Intégral*³¹³. The case is very

³¹³ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 71.

simple, notwithstanding the insecurity with which Maritain expresses himself. It is about an atheist who "*speculatively rejects God as the end and supreme rule of human life*"³¹⁴. Maritain maintains that God has resources so that even in this case "*the interior act of thought produced by this soul that speculatively denies God is directed towards a reality that, in fact, is truly God*". In other words, this soul would speculatively reject God because it would conceptualize him in formulas of negation and rejection, but, nevertheless, it would practically choose him as the end of its life. In other words, we would be facing "the atheist in good faith who, against his own apparent choice, will have really chosen God as the end of his life"³¹⁵.

In order to cover the proposed case, let us distinguish two questions. The first is the possibility that this *atheist of good faith* can be saved, that is, that he "really chooses God as the end of his life", as Maritain expresses it. And this affirmation of Maritain is a very serious error in absolute contradiction with the dogmatic teaching of the Church, according to which he who does not *explicitly* believe that God exists and that He is the rewarder of those who seek Him cannot be saved at all. How can he *explicitly* know God who in fact denies and rejects Him? And let it not be said, as Maritain tries to insinuate there, that he speculatively denies him but adheres to him practically under the guise of a formula in which he denies him. For at most, in this hypothesis, there would be an *implicit* knowledge of God, known under absolute terms such as truth, good, beauty, wisdom, virtue, freedom, but this is not enough according to the constant teaching of the Church. And the reason why it is not enough is very clear. For man's salvation consists in entering into the supernatural society of God. But no one enters this society unless he *freely* accepts it. But no one can *accept* the entrance unless he explicitly believes in this society, and he cannot believe in it, the knowledge of which is *revealed* by God himself, unless he explicitly believes in God the rewarding God. Therefore, *explicit* faith in God the remunerator is necessary. Hence Innocent XI condemned the proposition of those who say that in order to be saved "*faith, in a broad sense, produced by the testimony of creatures, or by some other similar motive*" is sufficient³¹⁶. Not at all. Faith in the divine word is necessary.

³¹⁴ Ibid.

³¹⁵ Ibid.

³¹⁶ *Denzinger*, prop. 1173.

It is necessary to believe *in God* and to believe *in God*. And not simply to believe that *God exists*, but that he is rewarding, that is, that he has provided the means for those who seek him to find him in supernatural society. For this reason, Innocent XI also condemned those who say: "Faith in one God is necessary, but not explicit faith that he is the Remunerator"³¹⁷ .

But there is a second question, and that is the very possibility of the "bona fide atheist". Can there be an atheist in good faith, that is, an atheist *without guilt*? Chapter XIII of the Book of Wisdom answers this question in its entirety and St. Paul in his *Letter to the Romans* also gives an intergiversable answer: "In fact," he says, "the invisible perfections of God, even his eternal power and divinity, became visible after the creation of the world, by 'manifestation'; the invisible became *visible*; then he speaks of the knowledge that his creatures give us of them; *and thus such men have no excuse*. St. Paul speaks of "knowledge," a clear and express knowledge that any man can have of God, a knowledge which, although it will not always have the precision that it can achieve in the philosopher, is sufficiently clear and express as the truths of common sense to refer to a Supreme Being, distinct from the world and its Creator and Ordainer. For this reason, the Vatican Council condemned those who "say that one and only true God, our Creator and Lord, *cannot be known with certainty*, with the light of human reason, by means of created things". Now then; Maritain's bona fide atheist who *speculatively* denies the existence of God would lack the speculative intellectual act which consists in being able to say, "I am *certain* that the Creator of what we see exists." But it is so that this act is in the hands of every man because he is man; therefore he cannot lack it without guilt. Therefore, there cannot be an atheist in good faith.

Moreover, it should be noted, as Garrigou-Lagrange teaches, that the definition of the Vatican Council demands a *certain adherence*, "of which we can be aware; it is not a belief that rests on the testimony of God, or on the testimony of tradition, or on the testimony of the human race. It is the *result of rational evidence*. We should not confuse "this natural light of reason" with the conscience, the religious sense, or the religious experience of which the modernists speak.... Nor is it sufficient to understand by the "natural light of reason" the "natural light of reason" the "natural light of reason" of which the modernists speak.

³¹⁷ Ibid., prop. 1172.

reason" practical reason in the Kantian sense. This interpretation would obviously be contrary to the terms of the Council; Kant's practical reason does not adhere to the truth of *things* because it *perceives this truth*, it is directed only to a *moral faith* whose certainty is subjectively sufficient, though objectively insufficient." (*Critique of Practical Reason*, I, 1. II. c. 5)³¹⁸ . Let us end this point with what Garrigou-Lagrange writes there: "Theologians commonly deny the possibility of ignorance or invincible error about the existence of God; that is to say, that speculative atheism is not possible in a man who has the use of reason and truly in good faith"³¹⁹ .

The true Fellowship

Pius IX in his famous speech *Quanto conficiamur moerore* of August 10, 1863 on indifferentism, exposes the only acceptable *fellowship*:

Let it not be understood by this," says the Pope, "that the Sons of the Catholic Church are in any way to be enemies of those who are not united with us by the same bonds of faith and charity; On the contrary, let them always strive to help them with all works of Christian charity when they see them poor and sick, or afflicted by any other calamities, trying first of all *to rescue them from the darkness of error*, in which they miserably lie, and to *reduce them to the Catholic truth, and to the guild of the Church*, our most loving mother, who never ceases to stretch out her maternal hands to them with love, and to call them to herself, so that, founded and abiding in faith, hope and charity, and bearing fruit in every good work, they may obtain eternal salvation". The truth with regard to non-Catholics must be clearly proposed, even *for* their own orderly and Christian *love*. *It* is true that the light of truth descends and spreads directly or indirectly from the chair of the Church, and that the news of divine revelation reaches many, even strangers, at least as regards the fundamental articles which must be *explicitly believed*, so that they may be converted to God through perfect charity and reach, outside the sacrament, the grace of justification.

³¹⁸ Garrigou-Lagrange, *Dieu*, 5th ed. pp. 19ff.

³¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

God has no need of any human ministry to inspire the faith which is the beginning and root of all justification in him who is disposed by the help of grace offered outside the limits of the Church, as St. Thomas teaches, *De Veritate*, q. 14. a. 11. ad. 1. But it is also certain that God constituted a visible and discernible Church as an ark outside of which there is no salvation. And even if it is possible to reach it by desire alone, it is only possible for those who *are in invincible ignorance*; and it must also be said that the condition of these is terribly precarious, because of the lack of so many and so great aids which are not to be had outside the real communion of the Church.

The words of Pius X in the *Sillon* are appropriate: "We wish to call your attention, Venerable Brethren, to this distortion of the Gospel and of the sacred character of Our Lord Jesus Christ, God and Man, practiced in the *Sillon* and elsewhere. In discussing the social question, it is fashionable in certain circles first to discard the divinity of Jesus Christ and then to speak no more of his extreme meekness, of his compassion for all human miseries, of his pressing exhortations to love of neighbor and fraternity. It is true that Jesus Christ loves us with immense, infinite love, and that he came to earth to suffer and die so that gathered around him, in justice and love, animated by the same sentiments of mutual charity, all men might live in peace and happiness. But with supreme authority he set *as a condition for this temporal and eternal happiness, to be of his flock, to accept his doctrine, to practice virtue and to allow themselves to be taught and guided by Peter and his successors*. Moreover, if Jesus was good to the lost and sinners, he did *not respect their erroneous convictions*, however sincere they might seem; he loved them all *in order to instruct, convert and save them*. If He called to Himself, in order to relieve them, those who suffer labors and pains, it was not to preach to them *the emulation of a chimerical equality*. If he lifted up the humble, it was not to inspire them with the feeling of an *independent dignity and rebellious obedience*. If his heart overflowed with meekness for souls of good will, it did not fail to flame with holy indignation against the profaners of the house of God, against the wretches who scandalize the little ones, against the authorities who burden the people with the weight of unbearable burdens without them laying a finger to help lift them up. He was as energetic as he was gentle; he scolded, threatened, punished, knowing and teaching us that often fear is the beginning of wisdom and that sometimes it is convenient to cut off a limb to save the body".

Beware then that Maritain's discourse does not serve to attenuate the fearful condition of *invincible* ignorance; that it does not serve to *criminally reassure* those who think "that the fact that certain men live in error and are separated from the true faith and from Catholic unity does not prevent them from attaining beatitude" (Pius IX, *Quanto conficiamur*); Beware that all the "fraternal dialogue" on which we should not judge the state before God of those who do not commune with the Catholic faith³²⁰ de *Principes d'une Politique humaniste*, does not serve to justify a regime of egalitarian human coexistence, without religious differences, in which the Holy Church is not recognized as having divine primacy over all the powers and opinions of the earth, and that the "ecumenical" rapprochement between separated Christians³²¹ does not serve to establish religious indifferentism.

The cooperation of men of different faiths in temporal order

"From these reflections it follows," Maritain concludes, "that in the Catholic perspective in which I am placed, the rapprochement between believers of all religious denominations could not be fulfilled, on the religious and spiritual plane itself, but by and in friendship and charity, by and in the pure spirituality and freedom of love, without turning to any species of communion less elusive and more determined, more visible, expressed in the order of speculative and practical understanding by some community of symbol or sacred form."³²² .

This could be admitted without difficulty, provided he meant what St. Thomas teaches in Article VI of Question 25 of II. II. when he asks himself whether "sinners are to be loved out of charity," and answers: "I answer by saying that in sinners two things can be considered, namely, nature and guilt. In regard to the nature which they have from God they are capable of beatitude, on the communication of which charity is founded, as was said above (q. 25, 3.), and for this reason, according to nature, they are to be loved in charity. But their guilt is contrary to God and is a hindrance to the

³²⁰ *Principes d'une politique humaniste*, pp. 147 and 148.

³²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 151.

³²² Ibid., p. 152.

beatitude. Wherefore, as to guilt, *all sinners* are contrary to God and *are to be hated*, also father, mother, and relatives, as it is recorded in *Luke*, XIV. We ought to hate sinners as sinners, and to love them as men, capable of blessedness; and this is to love them truly for God's sake."

And let it not be said that we do not know "what they are in the sight of God"; for we must proceed according to what, *in the external forum* of life, they are and profess to be. Heretics, unbelievers, Jews, heathens, as such, are out of the way of health; their public profession therefore, is deviant and baneful. Our friendship with them, if it is true and orderly, should be directed not to confirm them in the error in which they live, but to lead them to the truth that saves. If they are *sincerely* in error, it will be easier for us to discover the truth so that they will repudiate it from their lives.

"But on the plan of the temporal and profane life - Maritain continues³²³ - it is convenient on the contrary that this rapprochement is expressed in common activities, that it finds meaning in a more or less close cooperation for concrete and determined objectives - that it is a question of the common good of the political city, to which we belong respectively or of the common good of the temporal civilization as a whole.

"And certainly in such a domain it is not as believers, but as belonging to such a homeland, as being bound together by the customs, traditions, interests, ways of feeling and seeing of a carnal community, or as having in common a concrete historical ideal, that believers of different religions are called to carry out a common work. But in this temporal common work itself, ethical and spiritual values are included, which are of interest to the believer as such. And in this same temporal common work the effective element of primary importance (I say primary, I do not say sufficient) for the pacification of men, is the benevolence and friendship of which we spoke before. In this sphere of temporal and public life, the better word is not *love of charity*, but *civic friendship*, which is a virtue of the natural order that must be activated by charity"³²⁴ .

³²³ Ibid.

³²⁴ Ibid.

Maritain attempts here again to *separate* the temporal plane from the spiritual plane. There is no such separation and we have seen how St. Thomas, when he raises the problem of the relations of the faithful with the infidels, does so with respect to relations on the *temporal plane*; relations arising from necessities of life. "*Si necessitas urgeat*" "*vel absque necessitate eis communicent*". The danger to the integrity and purity of the faith for the faithful exists precisely when, by reason of their *temporal business*, they have to enter into relations with the infidels. In spiritual matters they have no reason to communicate with them, unless they have received a *special* mandate, a mission from the Church herself.

The most explicit and categorical directives, emanating from the Roman Chair, on the collaboration of Catholics, are those given by Pius X on December 24, 1912, regarding collaboration in *temporal affairs*. In the Letter *Singulari quadam*, addressed to Cardinal George Kopp, Bishop of Breslau and to the other Archbishops and Bishops of Germany, Pío X pronounced a definitive resolution in the matter that had arisen among Catholics regarding the licitness of joining interdenominational "Christian" unions.

1° *The Pope first emphasizes the seriousness of the question.* "The more earnest we have been in this matter, the more we have understood in the full consciousness of our Apostolic Office that the most sacred of our duties was to see to it that the Catholic doctrine be preserved among our most beloved children in sincerity and integrity, not allowing their faith to be endangered in any way. For if they are not warned in time there is a danger that little by little and almost unnoticed they may become accustomed to a kind of *vague and indefinite Christianity*, which is ordinarily called *interdenominational* and which is spread under the false label of a common Christian faith, when it is manifest that there is nothing more contrary to the preaching of Jesus Christ".

2° *The Pope is mindful of the need to collaborate with those of other religions in temporal problems.* "It is added to this," continues the Pope, "that Our greatest desires are to foster and consolidate concord among Catholics and to put away all causes of dissension which, by dividing the strength of the good, can only profit the enemies of religion; moreover, We desire and long for Our Sons to keep with the same citizens far from

the Catholic Faith that peace without which neither the order of human society nor the prosperity of the city can subsist".

3° *The Pope reminds us that the first thing is to keep the Catholic faith.* "Thus in the first place We teach that the duty of all Catholics, a duty which must be guarded religiously and inviolably in all circumstances of life, both private and public, is to hold firmly and fearlessly the principles of Christian truth as taught by the Magisterium of the Catholic Church.... In all that *the Christian does, even in temporal things, it is not licit for him to neglect supernatural goods*; on the contrary, the rules of Christian wisdom prescribe him to direct all things to the Highest Good as his ultimate end; all his actions, good or bad, in the moral order, that is, in agreement or disagreement with natural or divine law, are subject to the judgment and jurisdiction of the Church".

4° *Confessional unions deserve only unreserved approval.* "As for workers' associations, even if their object is to procure temporal advantages for their members, they are to be recommended without reservation and are to be considered as more suitable for the true and solid usefulness of their members, those which, founded on the basis of the Catholic religion, follow the Church as their guide.... that if it is a question of those associations which touch directly or indirectly on religion or morals, it could in no way be approved that in the said regions mixed associations, that is, those formed of Catholics and non-Catholics, should be encouraged or propagated. For not to insist on other points, there is no doubt that associations of this kind expose to great dangers or certainly may expose the integrity of the faith and the faithful observance of the laws and precepts of the Holy Church; which dangers many of you, Venerable Brethren, have openly manifested in the answers to this question."

5° *Catholics may, with certain precautions, become members of interdenominational unions.* "We declare that Catholics may be *tolerated and allowed* to join the mixed (so-called Christian) unions which exist in your diocese, as long as new circumstances do not render this tolerance inopportune and illegitimate, provided, however, that special precautions are taken to avoid the dangers which are inherent in associations of this kind".

6° *Two precautions to authorize this tolerance.* "Here are the main precautions. In the first place, it is necessary to see to it that the Catholic workers of these unions also enroll in the Catholic workers' associations, called *arbeitervereine*. That if for this they must make some pecuniary sacrifice, we are convinced that, in their zeal for the purity of their faith, they will do so without penalty. Moreover it is necessary that these unions - in order that to them Catholics may give their name - must be such that they abstain from all theories or acts which do not conform to the doctrines and norms of the Church or of the competent religious authority; and likewise, that in this respect there be nothing reprehensible in their writings, words, or acts. Wherefore *the bishops should diligently observe as the most sacred of their duties, how these societies conduct themselves, and watch that Catholics suffer no harm from relations with them.* As for the Catholics enrolled in these unions let them never consent that the unions, as such, *in seeking the temporal advantages of their members, profess or do anything which in any way may be contrary to the principles taught by the Supreme magisterium of the Church.* And for this reason, whenever questions arise which have to do with morals, that is, with justice and charity, the Bishops are to take care that the faithful do not neglect Catholic morals and do not deviate from them in the least".

From this teaching of the Pope it follows that *interdenominational collaboration* is a thing fraught with danger, which should not be permitted or tolerated except when there is no other means of achieving the temporal advantages it can bring, and even in this case, using every precaution, both on the part of the Catholics concerned and of the interdenominational association itself and of the Bishops who must take care that the integrity of the faith of Catholics does not suffer in the least.

The Pontiff's doctrine, like that of St. Thomas, refers then to inter-confessional collaboration *on the temporal plane*, because on another plane there can be no cooperation of any kind. Then the very posing of this question shows that Maritain perverts the concept of city; he conceives the plane of life of the city as *purely* temporal, where values of the *direct* jurisdiction of the Church are not included. The Christian city would not be a *temporal-spiritual*, natural-supernatural reality, and therefore, conformed to the Catholic conception of life; it would be a purely temporal city, whose conformation would be fixed

by the Church's direct jurisdiction.

by believing and non-believing lay people and even atheists. For this, turning his back on the Church, he seeks the basic principles (as if the Christian city were yet to be invented) in a common agreement. "For the society of tomorrow, he says, and the revitalized democracy we are longing for, the only solution is presented to us under a "pluralistic" type. Men belonging to the most different philosophical or religious creeds can and should cooperate in the *common task*, for the joint welfare of the community, founding *their agreement on the basic principles* of a society of free men. For a society of free men implies basic principles which constitute the basis of its very existence. Its duty is to defend and promote them. One of the errors of bourgeois optimism consisted in believing that in a free society "truth" and decisions conducive to human dignity and freedom would automatically emerge from the conflicts of forces and opinions; the error lay in conceiving free society as a neutral field for all kinds of ideas in mutual competition.

"In such a way, democratic society did not come to possess a concept of its concrete conduct, and liberty, disarmed and paralyzed, remained at the mercy of the acts of those who hated it and tried by all means to encourage in men a vicious desire to free themselves from liberty. If it is to overcome totalitarian tendencies and fulfill the hopes of the peoples of the world, the democracy of tomorrow must have its *own concept of man and society, its own philosophy, its own faith*, which will put it in a position to educate the people for freedom and to defend itself against those who would use democratic freedoms to destroy liberty and human rights"³²⁵ .

The universal common faith of the new Christendom and the theory of the analogy

But here, in all its reality, the problem to which we alluded earlier presents itself: what "*universal common faith*" of cooperation can be established between

³²⁵ *El Pueblo*, of Buenos Aires, of 13V/1945.

Men who admit a supernatural ultimate end of life and others who do not? *What basic common principles?* Here Maritain brings into play his saving notion of *analogy*.... And starting from the fact of the *identity* of human nature, he maintains that even if there is no identity of doctrine, there can be between the *different* principles and doctrines a community of proportion, "an *analogy* with regard to the practical end in question, which, although it refers to a higher end, is of a natural order and although it is undoubtedly conceived by one or the other according to each one's own perspective, in the existential reality it will be extraposed to the conceptions of each one; and that, thus considered, in real existence, it will disappoint to a certain extent, although realizing them, the particular conceptions of each one"³²⁶ . "...This *analogical cooperation* would be not simply to establish a technique, to extinguish a fire, to help a hungry or a sick person, but also and above all *in a constructive action concerning the right life of the temporal city and of the terrestrial civilization and the values that are enclosed there*"³²⁷ .

Maritain's thought is clearly expressed. Believers, non-believers and atheists would practically agree in "a constructive action of the temporal city", in "their own concept of man and society", in "their own philosophy", in "their own faith". This *community*, although it does not imply "*univocity* between the paths along which each one walks and the good practical agreement is not founded on a common minimum of doctrinal identity...." in another sense there is much more than a common minimum, since among those who "belonging to different religious families, let pass between them the spirit of love, the implications of fraternal love create in the principles of practical reason and action, with respect to earthly civilization, a community of similarity and *analogy* which corresponds on the one hand to the fundamental unity of our rational nature and which on the other hand does not concern only a *minimum* number of points of doctrine, but goes into the whole series of practical actions and the principles of action of each one". "It is not in an equivocation that they are grouped together to cooperate for the good of the city. It is in the community of analogy between principles, movements, practical ways, implied by the common recognition of the law of love, and corresponding to the inclinations of each one, that they are grouped together to cooperate for the good of the city.

³²⁶ *Principes d'une politique humaniste*, p. 159.

³²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 160.

first of human nature"³²⁸ . "And why should I dissemble that for my Christian, in the faith of him whose name alone has been given to men in which they can be saved even in the temporal order, this community of analogy supposes *a first analogate* pure and simply true, "and that implicitly or explicitly it is to Christ, known to some, unknown to others, that he tends in short, under more or less perfect form, and more or less pure, all that there is of authentic love working in the world of men and for the common good of their life here below?"³²⁹ ."

And what are those analogical notions, "principles," "movements," "paths" on which materialists, idealists, agnostics, Christians and Jews, Muslims and Buddhists can agree, not by virtue of an identity of doctrines but by analogical similarity of practical principles, tending toward the same practical conclusions? Answer: "if they have a similar reverence for truth and intelligence, human dignity, freedom, brotherly love and the absolute value of moral good"³³⁰ .

In Maritain's conception, therefore, although materialists, agnostics, idealists, atheists, socialists, Jews and Catholics differ profoundly with respect to *the ultimate end of life* and consequently with respect to life itself, they can reach a *practical* agreement on the *practical* way of concluding life; and this conduct of life will also entail a practical coincidence on the end and the structure of the city. And the Catholic who has a *supernatural conception* of life and therefore with respect to all these values, how will he be able to *coincide* with those who have only a purely naturalistic conception? Maritain answers: "although they have different principles and doctrines, an analogy in front of the practical end in question and that, of itself, although referred to a superior end, is of natural order; and although conceived undoubtedly by the ones and by the others according to the own perspectives of each one, *in the existential reality it will be extra placed to the conceptions of each one...*"³³¹ .

³²⁸ Ibid., pp. 166-167.

³²⁹ Ibid., p. 167.

³³⁰ *El Pueblo*, ibid.

³³¹ *Principes d'une politique humaniste*. p. 159.

But let us see: what is the practical end in question? It is a *regulating* end of the human actions that are executed... so that in the case of a city, of human coexistence, this results as an effect that is not *external* to men as a work of art could be, but the life of the city, as such, results from the *human* actions -individual and social- that the men of the city fulfill.

The city is not an effect distinct from the men who live in it; and the *how* of the city is not distinct from the *how they live*; and this *how they live* depends on *how they think* about what life should be; and this how they think about life depends first and foremost on the ultimate end of life. *The ultimate purpose of life is the regulator of all human actions and their internal shaping.*

Now, how can a Catholic and a materialist coincide in "the practical end," in "the practical work" to be accomplished? The former will place as the first fundamental principle of the city "the sovereign authority of God over the social life of which he is the Creator and sole Regulator"³³² ; the latter will place the purely material. Both will be able to speak of *freedom*, but for the one freedom will be to structure the city according to the divine laws, both natural and supernatural, for the materialist, on the other hand, it will be to do everything of expansion to the material instincts of life...; in both cases "the practical end", the *extra* practical effect *placed in the existential reality* will be completely and entirely different. A "practical end", a "common work" "to Catholics and atheists will imply the sacrifice in fact of the truths whose deposit the Catholics have, not establishing them as it is necessary, that is to say, as a cornerstone, to spirits for whom they should constitute the first object"³³³ .

If the Catholic has as the "practical end" of his life God loved above all, as the Holy Church teaches, his civic life, the *city he will build with his life*, will be such that in it God will be the First Beloved and the Church the first honored; if the materialist has as his "practical end" material advantages, his civic life, *the city he will build with his life*, will be such that in it everything material and carnal will occupy the first place and that which refers to God will be barely *tolerated*. Although both of them speak of and realize as a "practical aim" the

³³² *Pourquoi Rome a parlé*, p. 200.

³³³ *Ibid.*, p. 203.

freedom, equality and fraternity, they will be realizing two realities as diverse and opposed as a city to the glory of God and another city to the glory of man.

Maritain's attempt to constitute a "practical end" common to believers and non-believers and even atheists hides the *political physicism* that Maritain blamed on the *Action Française*³³⁴. Consequently, the arguments that Maritain brought against this physicism of *the Action Française* are entirely valid against the position he holds today. Because politics, he said then, "is a system of means justly distributed in view of the ends of man, *the temporal common good cannot be truly known if the true ultimate end of life is not; otherwise it cannot be avoided that each person is either treated as the ultimate end*, or entirely subordinated to the nation, constituted as the ultimate end; otherwise, one forgets that the force of conservation of society is justice, one forgets that the unity is bound by moral duties towards God, towards the persons and the families that it groups in its unity, towards the other cities"³³⁵. "For the same reason that it is about man and the direction of his acts, it is on the one hand impossible for a true science and a true political *prudence* to be constituted, we do not say only that they are finished, we say also that they begin to be constituted without radical vice where *reason* does not know God and his precepts".

If with totally different conceptions of life, such as those of an atheist and those of a Catholic, there is a coincidence and community in the work accomplished, it can only be due to the fact that this conception of life does not influence the work that is accomplished; or if it does influence, it influences *in a distorted, perversely distorted way*. If a Catholic who conceives *freedom* as a *pure means* to reach *God*, the ultimate end of the creature, coincides in a *practical social realization* of freedom with the atheist, who takes freedom as *an end*, it is because one and the other have forgotten to place God first in the *free* city they have built; the Catholic will continue to work for God, *within* his conscience; but in the structuring and creation of the city as such, God will not be there. And if the atheist and the Catholic have agreed on a total and common task, regarding the "practical fabrication of the city", it is because the latter does not arise as a *moral* effect of moral actions, but as a physical effect of actions that on the other hand

³³⁴ *Clairvoyance de Rome*, p. 169.

³³⁵ Ibid., p. 171.

The city's social and political structures may be moral, but they are not so insofar as they create the city. Such and no other was the pretended *physicalism of the Action Française* against which Maritain indignantly raised.

Maritain has a dangerous illusion when he speaks of *civic friendship* as a bond of union of all believing and non-believing citizens of the new Christianity. Because even "*civic friendship*", seen as a "common practical end", will be totally different, not only in a *theoretical* conception, but as a *term of the actions* of those who profess different religious or metaphysical points of view. For if *friendship* is not pure sentimentality, it entails a mutual exchange of *goods* between those who are bound by friendship, civic goods when the friendship is purely civic. But how are civic goods to be measured? According to what criterion? That of the atheist or that of the Catholic? How are the goods of the city to be measured? And here the question of the ultimate end of the city is repeated as decisive and definitive in resolving the nature of this *civic friendship*. For the "practical end" of a *civic friendship* between Catholics and atheists cannot be the same³³⁶.

The application of the Thomistic theory of analogy, attempted by Maritain to justify the collaboration of individuals most opposed by their religious beliefs and philosophical conceptions in a human work, insofar as human, such as the temporal city, involves the most radical perversion of the first principles of moral science; those first principles that Maritain has recalled many times in his speculative works and even in his practical ones. "It is to this title that the knowledge (of ethics or moral philosophy), he writes, is oriented - by far - towards the operable taken as such, and towards the position of the act in existence: hence the proper characters of moral philosophy which we have pointed out in chapter VIII; and this makes it a normative science, which must necessarily take into account not only what is, but what ought to be, which is suspended from the consideration of ends, and first of all of the ultimate end (ends playing in the practical order the same role as principles in the speculative order)"³³⁷. And in practical works he has written especially against the *Action Française* he writes: "Political laws, like other laws, are founded on the nature of things, but nature, the

³³⁶ II, II, 25, 7.

³³⁷ *Les Degrés du savoir*, p. 882.

This thing, to which they refer, is not a nature, a thing like the others; this thing is the human being, this nature is endowed with freedom and morality, ordered to an ultimate end which is God himself"³³⁸ .

If this is so, if the moral nature of man, and therefore of his moral acts, is in necessary dependence on God, the ultimate end of every human act and the positively regulating end of that act, it follows that *the same operable*, as is the political city, cannot be worked as a *common effect* by those who do not communicate in the knowledge of this end. For them to be able to communicate in the working of *the same operable* it would be necessary either that the ultimate end, God of Revelation in this case, could be excluded from the operable or that its knowledge would not be necessary. But the first is impossible, because as Maritain teaches there³³⁹ : "the laws that concern the action of reasonable nature cannot make abstraction of its ordering of its true ends, nor of the *values* that enter into the very constitutive of human acts, insofar as they are human". If therefore the ends, and consequently the ultimate end, necessarily enter into the operable, and if on the other hand an atheist, without renouncing his atheism, coincides with a Catholic in working "*the same political operable*", which is the new Christianity, it would be because the Catholic has coincided with the atheist, abstracting from the operable the ordination to God the ultimate end. Therefore, he would have modified the substance of the *operable*, he would have stripped it of its *moral* condition, turning it into a mere *feasible*.

In the production of a *feasible*, a house for example, an atheist and a Catholic can agree not only because its construction does not involve a necessary and essential ordination to God, but also because even though they may have different theoretical conceptions about it, they can, each one in different perspectives and for different reasons, coincide *in the same existential reality extraposed to the conceptions of each one*; but in the operable in no way, because in its constitution enters *the very ordination of the action*, the theoretical conception. As Maritain himself wrote: "One cannot know the laws of human acts (one cannot therefore realize them) without knowing the nature and the end of these acts. This, which is true of the laws of ethics

³³⁸ *Clairvoyance de Rome*, p. 132.

³³⁹ Ibid.

in general, the same is true of politics, however great the proportion of elements external to the will of man may be in it"³⁴⁰ .

To say that the knowledge of the end is not necessary for the intrinsic conformation of the *operable* would be to incur in "instintivism" or in "the city", simple fact of nature, in which the *Action Française* incurred, as if the city were a troop of buffaloes or an anthill. This is where Maritain's thought seems to lurk in this *analogical* community of such diverse collaborators, when he speaks of a community of "principles, movements, practical paths", "common recognition of the law of love"³⁴¹ , "common feeling", "simple natural perceptions", "starting from the fact of love", "starting from the fact of the city", "starting from the fact of nature" and "starting from the fact of the city". ³⁴² starting from the fact of identity of nature even if there is no identity of doctrine"³⁴³ .

Against him then are worth all the arguments which, in Chapter III, *Morale et Politique de Clairvoyance de Rome*, he devotes to *l'Action Française*. "Neither in founding nor in sustaining the family or society, nor in any of his properly human acts, is man led by "instincts," that is, by a gear of invariably determined tendencies; he is led by reason, in the light of which he must order his activity by moral rules and by virtue, or, if he is not guided by reason, he is dragged along by passions, which quickly destroy, instead of founding anything..... In reality man is not built to be an instinctive animal."³⁴⁴ ... "a human society must be built up by a reason that chooses forms of life in conformity with a certain idea of the good of man; it presupposes, from the beginning, a rational regulation of the appetites that guide the choice"³⁴⁵ . "Neither egoism, nor instinct, nor a determination already made in nature, but justice, is the essential element of the structure of societies and so to speak their skeleton. Man can make of the relations of justice very different notions, as different as he likes, but every human society is built on these notions and its consistency and its value as a society are due to the truth of these norms of justice on which it is built. Such is the

³⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 133.

³⁴¹ *Principes d'une politique humaniste*, p. 160.

³⁴² *El Pueblo*, *ibid.*

³⁴³ *Principes d'une politique humaniste*, p. 160.

³⁴⁴ Ibid., pp. 147-148.

³⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 153.

tradition of high humanity. Thomas Aquinas invokes St. Augustine and Cicero on this point. To define what a people is, "*a people*," he writes, "*is a multitude associated by the agreement of law and the community of the public good*, whence it follows that "to the very essence of law it belongs that relations between men be ordered by the just precepts of the laws" (I. II. 105. 2.)³⁴⁶ .

If what Maritain wrote in *Clairvoyance de Rome* retains its value, if to build and maintain a human society instinct is not enough and "rules of *reason* and *virtue*", "rational regulation of appetites", "justice", "notions about the relations of justice" are required, it does not appear how "principles, movements, practical ways", "common recognition of the laws of love", "common feeling", "simple natural perceptions", "identity of nature even if there is no identity of doctrine", can build a *common* city.

It would be better to say that, unfortunately, if Catholics, Protestants, Jews, materialists, liberals, socialists, communists, atheists, were to reach a *practical* agreement on the structure and vital conformation of the city, it would be because *such a city* would not be the *effect* of the regulations of human reason and Revelation, but the effect of an *enlightenment* philosophy that would have given, as we observed above³⁴⁷ , a *common* content to the terms *conscience*, *spirit*, *intelligence*, *liberty*, *human person*, *progress*, *equality*, *fraternity*, *emancipation*. Precisely on the basis of the *indeterminacy* of these words, which can, deceitfully, be accepted *equally* by those who profess different religions or metaphysics, the *union* of all is *taking place*, over and above different religious and philosophical creeds. Men who hold very different religious or metaphysical points of view," writes Maritain, "and even opposites -materialists, idealists, agnostics, Christians and Jews, Muslims and Buddhists-, can agree, not by virtue of an identity of doctrine, but by virtue of the analogical similarity of practical principles³⁴⁸ . In that common practical agreement, the Catholic keeps his *Catholic conception of life* intact, but he keeps it because it does not *influence life*. In real and lived life

³⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 154.

³⁴⁷ In the study of the *Myth of Progress to the New Christianity*.

³⁴⁸ *El Pueblo*, ibid.

influences the *enlightenment*. The Catholic thus works in the Masonic ideal of the Revolution.

Let us therefore suppose Maritain's dream come true. The day will come when "all the faithful will be able to live with people of other faiths, keeping for them perfect virtues of justice, love and intelligence, keeping at the same time in themselves the true Faith, perfectly integral and pure. In reality, on that day, men will have no need to practice these virtues with those of other beliefs because infidelity and religious division will have disappeared from the earth"³⁴⁹ .

But what will have happened? What will reign in the world, the universal Catholic faith or the *enlightenment* philosophy of the Revolution? Because, whatever you want, turn things as you like, this cooperation on basic, *common and universal* principles implies in the *public order of life*, of social and civilized life, the renunciation of the affirmation that *the Church is the Ark of Health for temporal society*... that the Church must shine above nations and peoples. Where is the *Immortale Dei* of Leo XIII? Where the *Quas Primas* of Pius XI?

"Now if we command that Christ the King be honored by all the Catholics of the world, with it we provide for the needs of the present times, bringing a most effective remedy to the plague that infests human society.

"The plague of our age is the so-called laicism, with its errors, its impious incentives; and you know, venerable brethren, that such impiety did not mature in a single day, but has long been incubating in the viscera of society. It began by denying the Empire of Christ over all peoples; the Church was denied the right, derived from the right of Christ, to teach the peoples, that is, to give laws, to govern the peoples in order to lead them to eternal happiness. Little by little the Christian religion was equated with the other false religions, and indecorously lowered to the level of these; here, therefore, it was subjected to civil authority, and thrown to the discretion of princes and magistrates; it went still further; there were some who tried to replace the religion of Christ with a certain religious sentiment.

³⁴⁹ *Principes d'une politique humaniste*, p. 169.

natural; there were not lacking States, which understood to pass without God, and put their religion in the irreligion and in the contempt of God Himself".

What should we think, therefore, of this Maritainian attempt to build the universal future city on the common basis of believers and non-believers and even atheists? Pius X said it definitively in his Letter of the *Sillon*: "Here it is, founded by Catholics, an interdenominational association to work for the reform of civilization, a work primarily religious, for it is a proven truth and historical fact that there is no true civilization without moral civilization, nor moral civilization without true Religion, so that the pretext of the new sillonists is vain when they allege that they will work only "in the field of practical realities", where the diversity of beliefs is of no importance.

"The result of this promiscuous collaboration, the beneficiary of this cosmopolitan social action can only be a democracy which will be neither Catholic, nor Protestant, nor Jewish; a religion (for Sillonism, as its leaders have said, is a religion) more universal than the Catholic Church, and which will bring together all men made ultimately brothers and companions in "the kingdom of God." "One does not work for the Church, one works for Humanity".

Here is the explanation of the "Maritainian" case. *One does not work for the Church, one works for Humanity.*

This virus of "Humanity" and its "Progress" that took hold in Lamennais to disturb him and to lose him, this virus that also took hold in the Catholic liberalism of the 19th century and in the *Sillon* movement, has taken hold so strongly in Maritain that he dares to consider the position adopted in front of it as "practically decisive from the point of view of human societies"³⁵⁰. It is no longer Christ and his Church that unites and divides men. *It has been placed, for the ruin and resurrection of many, as a sign of contradiction*³⁵¹. Now, under the pretext of a greater differentiation³⁵² of temporal life, and of the earthly city as opposed to the kingdom of God and of eternal life, it is

³⁵⁰ *Les Droits*, p. 48; English ed., p. 58.

³⁵¹ Lk. II, 34.

³⁵² *Les Droits*, p. 41; English ed., pp. 47 ff.

establishes another sign of salvation and of ruin. "With respect to the kingdom of God and eternal life³⁵³ - Maritain writes - the acceptance or rejection of religious dogma points to the essential difference between spirits. *Con the temporal life and the earthly city, the acceptance or the rejection of the historical vocation of humanity*", point out the essential difference between the spirits. So that, from now on, the essential division between men, in the *lived* human life, which is and can be but one, will not be established by their religious profession, but by their profession of faith in Humanity, Progress, Liberty, Fraternity, Democracy. So that a saint who says as the Apostle commands: "*For me, my Life is Christ*", *mihi vivere Christus est*³⁵⁴ and the rest, as far as I accept it as far as it can be true and convenient for this unique end of life, will have to be banished from this city in which the fundamental and decisive question will be the "myth of Humanity". And just as Christ in the name of the Law was crucified outside the City, so tomorrow in the name of the Law of human Fraternity, Christ, in his Church, will be crucified outside the "New Christianity". Because if in that Fraternal City the supreme thing is the Fraternity, the Church that invokes rights of prelacy over everything human - *he constituted it universal heir of all things*³⁵⁵ - will have to be excluded as "*troublemaker of the people with its doctrine*"³⁵⁶ .

³⁵³ Ibid., p. 49; English ed., p. 58.

³⁵⁴ To Philippians, I, 21.

³⁵⁵ Hebrews, I, 2.

³⁵⁶ Lk. XXIII, 5.

THE NEW CHRISTENDOM, A DEMOCRATIZING CITY

Democracy is a more universal religion than the Catholic Church (words that Pius X applies to the *Sillon*).

Maritain wants to find the foundations of a city that, without renouncing the "Christian" character in the sense already explained, can unite by a unique bond, truly such, men of the most diverse religious and philosophical beliefs and disbeliefs.

He calls these common bases *democratic philosophy*³⁵⁷ or simply "democracy," taking care to note that this word, as used by modern peoples, has a much broader meaning than in the classical treatises of governmental science. First and foremost, it designates a general philosophy of human and political life, and a state of mind³⁵⁸. At some point, Maritain seems to have expressed some reluctance to adopt this term³⁵⁹: "The word democracy has thus given rise to so many confusions and misunderstandings that sometimes it would seem desirable to find a new word to designate the ideal of a community of free men. But it is not philosophers but the usage of men and the common conscience that fix the use of words in the practical order. And what matters above all is to rediscover the authentic intelligible value of words charged with great human hopes, and the tone with which they are pronounced by a conviction founded on truth". And lest anyone should accuse him of participating in the romantic optimism that attributes to the people an always just judgment and always upright instincts, he hastens to answer in a tone of unaccustomed aggressiveness: "I also know that one must be organized to be able to

³⁵⁷ *El Pueblo*, 13/V/1945.

³⁵⁸ *Christ. et Dém.*, Ed. de la Maison Française, New York, 1943, p. 39; English edition, Bib. Nueva, Buenos Aires, 1955, p. 43.

³⁵⁹ *Les Droits de l'homme et la loi naturelle*, Ed. de la Maison Française, New York, 1942, p. 71; English edition, Daedalus, 1955, p. 87.

express themselves and act. But I say that the tragic sophism of the reactionaries consists in confusing the conduct of a free people, acting within the framework of its legitimate institutions, with the bloody violence of crowds driven mad by collective passions, those collective passions that totalitarian propaganda diabolically inflames. I say that the man of common humanity has no less sound judgment and no less upright instinct than the social categories that believe themselves superior, and that in general terms - not because he is more intelligent, but because he is less tempted - his possibility of erring in the great questions that concern him, the people, is a little less than that of the so-called *elites* of informed, competent, wealthy, well-born and very cultured or very astute people, who separate themselves from the people and whose political imbecility, lowliness of soul and corruption astonish the universe today"³⁶⁰ .

After hearing the transcribed paragraph, the reader must enter the climate in which this Maritainian democracy develops, current in "the use of modern peoples" which involves "a general philosophy of human life and political life and a state of mind", fixed "by the common conscience", which hardly errs "in the great questions that interest it".

This "democracy" "does not exclude *a priori* any of the "regimes" or "forms of government" that the classical tradition has recognized as legitimate, that is to say, compatible with human dignity", and implies a consent of the spirits on the essential bases of common life, respect for human dignity, and the rights of the individual.³⁶¹ and implies a consent of the spirits on the essential bases of common life, respect for human dignity, and the rights of the individual; and translates the ideal of liberty, equality and fraternity, or, according to the American motto, liberty, justice and happiness"³⁶² .

From what has been transcribed it is clear that Maritain's "democracy" is in line, substantially identical, with the *enlightenment* conception of life that universal Freemasonry has made flourish with the Revolution. This must be kept in mind in order to gauge the scope of Maritain's thought, which, moreover, coincides in this, as we have noted when stating the character of the "democracy" of Maritain.

³⁶⁰ *Christ. et Dém.* p. 88; English ed. p. 96.

³⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 39; English ed., p. 43.

³⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 40; English ed., p. 45.

The "revolutionary" of his new Christianity, with Catholic liberalism, and especially with the form it took in the *Sillon* movement.

Maritainian democracy and the Sillon movement

A study of the *Sillon* movement that, within the possible brevity, consigns its most precise and typical characteristics, will allow us to establish its parallel with the Maritainian movement and to fix, with exactitude, to what extent the latter is made possible by the condemnations of Pius X in the famous Letter, addressed to the Cardinal Archbishops of France on August 23, 1910, in condemnation of the *Sillon*. Since the errors of Maritain's "New Christianity" are not usually expressly formulated, his comparison with the *Sillon* is very useful because they were not explicit there either, but had to be deduced and made evident, as Pius X does in his Letter of Condemnation.

Let us note that the *Sillon* is not a philosophical school, it is a *lived* social-political movement; it is therefore interesting to know the characteristics of the environment where it was incubated and where it was born. The *Sillon* was conceived in 1893, in the midst of the turmoil and upheavals that manifested themselves with the appearance of the encyclicals *Rerum Novarum* and *Au milieu des sollicitudes*; the state of feverish agitation and childbirth that appeared then in the milieu of French social Catholics took shape in three typical movements that, in the lived reality, intercommunicated among themselves: the Christian-democratic movement, the neo-Christian movement and Americanism. The Christian democratic movement won the most vociferous sector of French Catholicism at the end of the century and its slogan was "*il faut être démocrate, la religion l'exige et, c'est le vœux du Saint Père*". In the name of the *ralliement* by which the Holy Father invited and prescribed French Catholics to work within the Republic, without making the republican regime an essential issue, this group intended to interpret what it called "la politique pontificale" as an order to adhere to modern democracy. Nothing, however, in the pontifical texts, on the contrary, authorized such affirmations. It seemed that a veil stood between the faithful and the voice of the Roman encyclicals. The latter remained impotent, as if paralyzed, ignored by some, denaturalized by others and understood by few. Opinion was so wisely fabricated on this point, that it was

could be entitled an important chapter of contemporary history: *On the singular, conscious or suggested, but methodical and constant deformation of the pontifical teachings of Leo XIII*³⁶³.

Meanwhile, the old utopia of reconciling the Church with the "modern" democracy, born of the Revolution, first attempted by Lamennais, and resumed in 1848 by the *Ère Nouvelle*, was updated by the Americanist work of the American Bishop Mons. Ireland, *L'Église et le Siècle* that Abbé Klein, a shady "modernist" professor at the Catholic Institute of Paris, had just published, with a bold and resonant preface, where young people could learn that the Catholic Church "blesses democracy and considers it as the efflorescence of her own principles of equality, of fraternity, of liberty of all men before Christ and for Christ"³⁶⁴; and it was also updated by the *Roman russe* of Viscount Melchior de Vogüé, who would impose the fashion of Tolstoyism; the young Sillonists would become aware that the world had been worked for eighteen centuries by the leaven of the Gospel, and that the "last revolution coming out of this Gospel constitutes its triumph and definitive advent; Henri Béranger, Melchior de Vogüé, Jules Ferry, Paul Desjardins, spread this idealistic movement that won great sympathy among students who wanted to be baptized as *neo-Christians*. The apostasy of the young priest Victor Charbonnel, disavowed by Rome in his efforts to promote a Parliament of Religions that would meet in Paris on the occasion of the Universal Exposition of 1900, put an end to these dangerous fickle ideas that agitated the brains of the democratic-Catholics of the time.

In such a troubled atmosphere, the *ralliement* and the social encyclicals of Leo XIII, must have appeared to that dreamy youth of the end of the century, optimistic and full of hopes, as the definitive oblivion of the past and the dawn of the future; on the ruins of the old world would rise the new order of the future city. His great concern was to reconcile the Church with the century, and since there was a place in France where the conjunction of the Church and the century was at work, it was a place where the Church could be reconciled with the future, and where the new order of the future city would rise.

³⁶³ Abbé Dabry with Abbé Naudet constituted in the newspaper *La voix du siècle* the most advanced group of this movement.

³⁶⁴ *El Sillon*, 4/IV/1894.

and of the secular State, the *Stanislas* College, dependent on the University but under a religious direction with Catholic students, where the conjunction of the two spirits was incubated: there the *Sillon* was born. In 1894, Marc Sangnier and his friend Isabel, at the head of a small group, ardent and restless, organized meetings and conferences in a room of the College, placed at their disposal, which they baptized with the name of *La Crippe*; on January 10, they founded the monthly bulletin of the *Sillon*. The first article was an appeal, an *appeal* to "our brothers of twenty years".... "The old century, tired of its denial and its doubt, but discouraged to recover itself... turns to us with uneasiness, as if to ask us to repair the ruins it has made. ... What will the century to come be? Will it be the affirmation of ours, in this democratic and scientific longing that has been snatched from us for so long? Will we see it marked by an absolutely humanitarian movement?" Meanwhile M. Desjardins, worthy intellectual son of Tolstoy, founder of the *Union pour l'Action morale*, which aimed to group together in a "common spirit" men of good will of all classes, religions and beliefs, was one of the most assiduous lecturers at *La Crippe*. In this Tolstoist, romantic, dreamy, evangelical-Catholic atmosphere, *l' amitié du Sillon*, *l'Esprit du Sillon*, *la vie du Sillon* was being formed.

The spirit, the life, the common soul of the Sillon, was a romantic idealism of exaltation for universal democracy which, coming from the Gospel, was to be implanted in the world by the Gospel. The day when we have placed at the service of democracy this untiring, indestructible force," said Marc Sangnier, "which the faith of Christ has placed in our hearts, on that day, we will be able to free democracy, the French Republic, from the yoke of the sectarians and finally allow our country to see the dawn of a new great democratic and Christian century"³⁶⁵ .

The democratic doctrine of the *Sillon* is progressively developing under the pressure of this "experience" that envelops in a sentimental complex a conception of life; "experience" that, subconsciously but with real effectiveness, imagines democracy - a fraternal kingdom - as the supreme goal to which men on earth should aspire.

³⁶⁵ *Discours*, t. I, p. 139.

This first driving principle will then set in motion all the rest of religious, intellectual and scientific principles and theories, all the rest of affectivities and aspirations; everything will be subconsciously moved for the realization of the "future democracy that men could not have conceived without Jesus Christ"³⁶⁶

The character of a predominantly affective-religious "experience" with which the democratic profession is presented, explains the analogous phenomena registered by what we could call democratic pathology. Take a collection of *sincere democrats*, of the most diverse ideologies, religious, philosophical and political, but all agree on an equal *passion* for democracy. Even if they are liberals, radicals, socialists, Catholics, Protestants, atheists, they will feel more *united* than divided. Why? Because the driving principle of their experiences, of their lives, let us say, is democracy and not, as one might think, the affirmation of socialism, atheism or Catholicism. This observation also explains the coincidence that is inevitably established between "Catholic" democrats so diverse in their psychology, conditions of the times, environment, vocation. It is obvious that among a Lamennais, a Bishop Maret, a Montalembert, a Dupanloup, an Abbé Naudet, a Marc Sangnier, an American Monsignor, a Maritain, there are infinite psychic diversities. But among all of them there is a fundamental coincidence as far as social-political problems are concerned; the "experience" in all of them has the same movement and the same trajectory: because they all subconsciously obey the same first driving principle of their lives, the dream of a democracy that assures the universal brotherhood of men; and, since on the other hand they feel Catholic, sensibly fervent and active, democracy in them, being "a complete realization of the historical ideal in which we have placed our hopes", will be "the time in which the Apostle Paul will announce as the wealth of the world and the resurrection from among the dead"³⁶⁷.

For Maritain, democracy is first and foremost an "experience". There is no doubt that Maritain is a philosopher, endowed with exceptional conditions for speculation. But neither his position nor his conception of "democracy" is the fruit of a philosopher's reflections; it is the fruit of a psychic attitude, predominantly

³⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 107.

³⁶⁷ *Christ. et Dém.* p. 22; English ed. p. 20.

affective, to the service of which he will then put his exceptional intellectual gifts and his marvelous philosophical instruments. Hence, in the *psychic* point of departure (we do not say, in the historical, social, environmental influences, we say *psychic*, that is, produced in the *experience* itself, by the *predominance* of affective and sentimental determinants), Maritain coincides with Marc Sangnier, and his democracy with that of the *Sillon*. His works of political philosophy, since *Réligion et Culture* are loaded with these affective elements that are manifested in a singular way in his *Christianisme et Démocratie*. Affective elements, of passions that are difficultly uncontrolled, wrapped with religious ingredients that take on Catholic and Thomistic expressions and forms, elements, therefore, of *illuminist affective elements*. They imply a *pathos* of bad law, an *evangelical pathos* that neither comes from an intellectual reflection and conviction nor can be at its service. The reader will have the exact configuration of the phenomenon from some samples collected from his book: "The dark hope of millions of men is being constituted in the subsoils of history. We must hope, with them . . . that notwithstanding the physical and moral exhaustion of peoples, the vital resources hidden in them, and first and foremost, the peoples formed for freedom, will bring forth the necessary men and pave the way to a new civilization and to a new democracy, in which Christian inspiration will appeal not only in the West to the living traditions of the religion of Christ, but throughout the world, to the moral energies of the 'naturally Christian soul'"³⁶⁸. " ... In its essential principle this form and this ideal of common life which is called democracy, comes from evangelical inspiration and cannot subsist without it; and by virtue of the blind logic of historical conflicts and the mechanisms of social memory, which has nothing to do with the logic of thought, we have seen the leading forces of modern democracies deny for a century the Gospel and Christianity in the name of human freedom, and the leading forces of the Christian social strata fight for a century against democratic aspirations in the name of religion. In France, the workers' movement of 1848 was animated by a Christian flame, however hesitant it was at times"³⁶⁹. " ... The Christian spirit is today threatened in its existence by implacable enemies, fanatics of race and blood, of the pride of domination and hatred. In the midst of the dreadful trial, everything indicates that in the depths of the human conscience a powerful religious renewal is being prepared, which interests at the same time, and at the same time, a new religious renewal.

³⁶⁸ Ibid. pp. 20-21; English ed. p. 18.

³⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 32; Cas. ed., p. 36.

which will raise to its living springs all the persecuted, all the believers of the great Judeo-Christian family, not only the faithful of the Catholic Church and those of the Protestant churches, but also those of Judaism, whose abandonment to nameless sufferings and iniquities, and to the blade of unclean exterminators, would be for the soul intolerable scandal if it did not see in it a terrible call of the promises of its God"³⁷⁰ . "... Progress does not tend to bring about the recovery of paradise tomorrow by means of Revolution, but to bring about the passage of the structures of consciousness and the structures of human life to better states, and that, throughout the whole of history, until the advent of the kingdom of God and of the land of the risen ones, which is beyond history. Whether you believe or not in this advent, it is towards it that you turn if you believe in the forward march of mankind. And what is acquired by the profane conscience, if it does not turn to barbarism, is faith in the forward march of humanity"³⁷¹ .

The reader can appreciate the psychic, affective-religious phenomenon that we want to characterize by noticing how Maritain employs in the plane of philosophy and social-political activity, which he insistently places as appropriate in the temporal, profane and earthly, elements of religious affectivity: *dark hope... we must hope... Christian inspiration... that you believe or not... land of the resurrected.... If you believe in the forward march of humanity...*; unmistakable symptoms of *fideism* or *illuminism*, that is, of moving in the field of human activity not by strictly rational motives, but by dark and murky presentiments, divinations, hopes, beliefs, which can have no other real support than that which the fever of the imagination and the ardor of affective exaltation want to grant them.

"...Under the evangelical inspiration in function in history," he writes, "the profane conscience has understood the dignity of the people and of the man of common humanity. A faithful people, a small people of God, a real people called to participate in the work of Christ; a people as a community of citizens of a country, united under just laws; a people as a community of manual labor and as a reserve and resource of humanity for those who suffer in the face of the na-

³⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 45; English ed., p. 50.

³⁷¹ Ibid., p. 54; English ed. p. 59.

nature"... "Finally, under the inspiration of the Gospel in function in history, the profane conscience has understood that in the misfortunes and pains of our existence oppressed by the bronze laws of biological needs and by the weight of pride, injustice and the wickedness of men, a single principle of liberation, a single principle of hope, a single principle of peace, can lift up the mass of servitude and iniquity and triumph over it, because this principle descends in us from the creative source of the world, stronger than the world: the brotherly love whose law the Gospel promulgated to the scandal of the powerful, and which is, the Christian knows, the very charity of God poured into hearts"³⁷² .

This conception of "people" and "love" charged with *enlightenment* is typical of the Puritan-Calvinist sects that have forged American civilization and it is also typical, in a more *affectively* charged expression, of Lamennais, Saint Simon, Buchez, Enfantin. Lamennais' book *Paroles d'un croyant* overflows with these sentimental excesses. Maritain continues:

"...to have faith in liberty and fraternity, one needs a heroic inspiration and a belief that strengthen and vivify reason and that no one else but Jesus of Nazareth has incited in the world"..... "As Bergson demonstrated in his profound analyses, what philosophers have preached, is the impulse of a love infinitely stronger than philanthropy, since he is the life, within us, of the creative love of beings and makes, truly, of every human being our neighbor; he made human abnegation cross the closed borders of natural social groups, family group and national group, and extended it to the entire human race".... "Therein lies the deepest principle of the democratic ideal, which is the profane name of the ideal of Christianity. That is why," writes Bergson, "democracy is of evangelical essence, and has love as its principle".... "In the democratic ideal, and in the democratic state of soul," must be noticed - Bergson writes - "a great effort in the opposite direction to nature".... "Heroism is required here, not to bring a tragedy to a good conclusion, but to carry out a formidable adventure, begun by this country in the time of the *Pilgrim Fathers* and of the

³⁷² Ibid., pp. 55 and 62; English ed., p. 60.

precursors and in the great days of the declaration of independence and the war of independence. To call all men to the pursuit of such happiness, only if it is placed very high and the price it costs is known, is to undertake the greatest of temporal revolutions. And this makes no sense except if this call to the pursuit of happiness is, indistinctly, a call to heroism".... "It will be necessary, for this, that the tragic sense of life and the sense of the great human adventure meet again and penetrate each other; that the spirit of Europe and the spirit of America cooperate in a common good will. We do not believe that paradise is for tomorrow. But the work to which we are called; the work which it will be necessary to pursue, with all the more courage and hope as it will be betrayed at every instant by human weakness, must have as its goal, if civilization is to survive, a world of free men, penetrated in its profane substance by a real and living Christianity, a world where the inspiration of the Gospel will guide common life towards a heroic humanism."³⁷³

This "inverse (let us say inverted) sense of nature", this call to *heroism*, to undertake a *formidable adventure*, the romantic admiration *for the Pilgrim Fathers in pursuit of terrestrial happiness? to undertake the greatest of the temporal revolutions*, they discover that Maritain's psyche, in describing this, is dominated by an exaltation that takes him away: exaltation of a *beyond*, of a *term*, of a *future*... for whose uncertain conquest he would sacrifice all the real values of the civilization in which we live.

The words of Pius X in the *Sillon* acquire a surprising accuracy to characterize the Maritainian case.

"...the exaltation of their affections, the blind goodness of their heart, their philosophical mysticism mingled with a part of enlightenment, have drawn them into a new gospel, in which they have thought they saw the true Gospel of the Savior...."

³⁷³ Ibid. pp. 68, 72, 73, 74, 105 and 108; English ed. pp. 75, 79, 80, 81, 115 and 119.

Political emancipation

A *Christian-democratism* experienced in a "living" as a fundamental value explains the striking parallelism, even in their doctrinal content, of the two movements embodied in Marc Sangnier and Maritain, without recourse to direct influences.

The dignity of the human person

Let us begin to establish this parallelism. It is well known that Maritain forges his concept of democracy starting from the notion of the dignity of the human person.

"...One of the values - he says - included in the so equivocal word of democracy would be found saved here, I think in a rather affective and moral sense of this word, with reference to the dignity of the person of which the multitude has become aware in itself, not without doubt as possessing it or deserving it truly, but at least as being called to it; this popular civic conscience therefore excludes the domination *hétérogénique* (even good) of a social category on the basis of the people considered as a minor, and implies on the level of social life itself the respect of the human person in the individuals who compose this mass"³⁷⁴.

This concept of democracy coincides *curiously* with the concept of democracy held by the *Sillon*, according to the Letter of Pius X: "The *Sillon* has the noble concern of human dignity. But he understands this dignity in the manner of certain philosophers, of whom the Church is far from praising herself. The first element of this dignity is freedom, understood in the sense that every man, except in religion, is autonomous. From this fundamental principle he draws the following conclusions: Today the people are in tutelage under an authority distant from them; then they must free themselves from it:

³⁷⁴ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 206.

political emancipation. He is under the dependence of bosses who, holding his instrument of labor, exploit, oppress and degrade him, then he must shake off their yoke: *economic emancipation*. He is dominated, finally, by a so-called managerial caste to which his intellectual development assures an undue preponderance in the conduct of business; he must then subtract himself from their domination: *intellectual emancipation*. The leveling of conditions from this threefold point of view will establish equality among men, and this equality is true human justice. A political and social organization founded on this double basis, liberty and equality (which will soon be joined by fraternity), this is what they call democracy".

Consequently, both Maritain and the *Sillon*, starting from "the autonomy (political, social and intellectual) of the human person claim an emancipation from all *hétérogénique* domination *on the basis of the people considered as a minor*" (Maritain) and this as much in *the political* as in *the social and intellectual spheres*. The human person would reject all subjection.

If "the individuals who make up the mass" cannot achieve the dignity of their human person without eliminating all domination or *hétérogénique* tutelage, it follows that "democracy is the social organization that tends to bring to the maximum the conscience and responsibility of each one"³⁷⁵. This is precisely the famous definition of democracy, given by Marc Sangnier: "Democracy is the conscious and responsible people"³⁷⁶, guardian not only of their personal interests, but of the interest of the State and capable, from then on, of taking more and more care of the country's business. It is not a question, properly understood, of false equality in functions since there is no equality in capacities. It is not simply a question of an increase in welfare for the mass of the disinherited. It is above all and above all a question of an increase of civic life, of an intellectual and moral development, of an ascension of the popular means, each day more and more detached from the bonds of servitude of the body and of the spirit".

³⁷⁵ *El Sillon*, 25/VIII/1902, quoted by Barbier, *ibid*, IV, p. 395.

³⁷⁶ *La lutte pour la démocratie*, p. 40.

"The time has come - Maritain will say³⁷⁷ - to call upon the moral and spiritual reserves of the people, of common humanity.... And these moral and spiritual reserves are not an instrument in the hands of those in authority; they are the very power and the source of initiative of men conscious of their personal dignity and their responsibility".

Before proceeding further, let us observe how well the words of Pius X regarding "a false idea of human dignity" fit Marc Sangnier and Maritain, noting that, even if Maritain, as the most careful, is careful in his theoretical expressions, he says exactly the same thing as Marc Sangnier, and, what matters greatly, induces in the reader *the same kind of mind*. What is the meaning of his famous *prise de conscience*, "awareness of the dignity of the human person", especially if it is linked to his thesis affirmed at every step, that it has been operated with the *French Declaration of the Rights of Man* and with the *American Declaration* and with the *Pilgrim Fathers*³⁷⁸, but that the multitudinous *modern man* has acquired the *right* to govern himself and consequently, to emancipate himself? Marc Sangnier affirmed no differently. "Finally

-Pius X says, "as the principle and foundation of all the falsifications of the fundamental social notions, the *Sillon* establishes a false idea of human dignity. He says that man will not be truly man, that is, worthy of the name, until he has acquired an enlightened conscience, strong, independent, autonomous, powerful enough to dispense with the master, obeying only himself, and capable of assuming and bearing without deviation from his duty the gravest responsibilities. Here is a sample of those inflated phrases with which human pride is exalted, like a dream that drags man without light, without guide and without help along the path of illusion, where, waiting for the great day of full consciousness, he will be devoured by error and passions. And when will that great day come? Unless human nature changes (which is not in the power of the *Sillon*), will it ever come? Did the Saints, by whom human dignity reached its height, have that dignity? And the humble of the earth who cannot rise so high and who are content to trace modestly their own furrow in the category which Providence has assigned to them, energetically fulfilling their duties in humility, obedience, and

³⁷⁷ *Christ. et Dém.* p. 85; English ed. p. 93.

³⁷⁸ *Les Droits*, p. 101; English ed., pp. 127 ff.

Christian patience, will they not be worthy to be called men, they whom the Lord will one day bring out of their obscure condition to place them in heaven among the princes of his people?"

If human nature *has not changed*, why this glorification of pride in one's own dignity that man has *foolishly* acquired with the Revolution? For far from being *better* than in past ages, when he felt himself more humble, he is full of perversion and consequently of pride, which is nothing else than this awareness, this claim to emancipation.

Consenting authority

Maritain speaks of excluding all *hétérogénique* domination. Let us begin with the political. "It would be madness," he says, "and a great disaster, in a blind reaction against the errors of the nineteenth century, to reject with the anarchist-individualist democracy the communitarian-personalist democracy. Thus the idea of an *organic* democracy, which we want to consider here below the point of view of philosophical truth"³⁷⁹ ... Marc Sangnier³⁸⁰ writes: "We want an organic democracy, not an anarchic democracy. We are not individualists." And Maritain³⁸¹ adds: "This organic democracy does not suppress, even if it were in principle, authority or power: it wants it coming from the people and exercised on their behalf, and with them. At its root is the idea that... in the city, a hierarchical totality of persons, men must be governed as persons". And Marc Sangnier³⁸² says: "We need tradition to root and nourish democracy, hierarchy to maintain and orient it. But we demand a living and ever-evolving tradition, an evolutionary and not a retrograde force; we want a hierarchy that is not external, but internal, more and more unanimously consented every day. We do not intend to suppress authority and replace it with the stupid tyranny of blind majorities; we believe, on the contrary, to fortify the very principle of authority, elevating to full civic dignity an ever greater number of individuals".

³⁷⁹ *Principes d'une politique humaniste*, Editions de la Maison Française, New York, 1944, p. 59.

³⁸⁰ *L'Esprit démocratique*, p. 173.

³⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

³⁸² Ibid.

But what is the meaning of this authority to which Maritain refers, "coming from the people and exercised on their behalf and with them"? He answers: "By virtue of the obscure work of evangelical inspiration, the profane conscience has understood that the authority of rulers, because it emanates from the author of human nature, is addressed to free men who do not belong to a master and is exercised by virtue of the consent of the governed"³⁸³. Marc Sangnier will say: "Is it not precisely a character of democratic evolution to show us an authority that is less and less imposed and more and more consented to, less and less external and in a certain way more and more internal, more and more desired, more and more moral?"³⁸⁴.

And in what way is this consented authority exercised? "An organic democracy," replies Maritain³⁸⁵, "will not seek to erase from its ideology the notion of authority, on the contrary it will put it in evidence, because it will admit this double truth of common sense that to obey, according to the just measure in which in such a case such a right is exercised, the one who really has the right to direct the action is in itself an act of reason and freedom; and that to obey in this way one who truly fulfills the office of directing the common work towards the common good (as in a soccer or hockey game a player obeys his team leader) is to act as a free man, that is to say that he is not in the service of another man". And the *Sillon* will say: "Therefore, to the same extent that authority solidly rooted in universal consent, in the ever clearer conscience and in the always better expressed will of each one, will be able to dispense more with brute force, or even legal force, this authority will be democratic"³⁸⁶ ...

Maritain also tends to suppress this power of "contrainte", of coercion, when he writes: "it will also be understood that the power of "contrainte", of coercion, is a power of "contraction".

"contrainte"... is not the substance of authority, but only an attribute of it which needs to be completed in order to have efficacy over men, either with respect to non-adults, or with respect to antisocial elements".... And since, on the other hand, the people have reached the consciousness of a greater person³⁸⁷, strictly speaking the force of the law will only be exercised against antisocial elements,

³⁸³ Christ. *et Dém.* p. 57; English ed. p. 62.

³⁸⁴ *Discours*, t. I, p. 512.

³⁸⁵ *Principes d'une politique humaniste*, p. 61.

³⁸⁶ Quoted por E. Barbier, *Histoire du catholicisme liberal*, t. IV, p. 398.

³⁸⁷ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 243 and passim.

particularly against the "totalitarian who denies the freedom of his neighbor and the dignity of the human person"...³⁸⁸ .

"At the origin of this democratic sentiment - taken in its human truth" - where "the authority exercised over the people, will come from them and will be exercised on their behalf and with them", "consented authority", practically free from coercion, similar to that of a captain of a soccer team who receives his authority to regulate the game from the players themselves, "there is - says Maritain³⁸⁹ - the desire "not to obey but himself"; "there is the desire not to obey *but what is just*".

But since, on the other hand, "once the man of common humanity has understood that he is born with the right to direct his own life, as responsible for his acts before God and before the law of the city (which emanates from him, let the reader not forget), how would you want the people to obey those who govern, except because they have received from the people themselves the burden of the common good of the people?"³⁹⁰ . Then man *obeys himself*. For if he obeys only when he is just and is just only when he consents, it follows that when he obeys, he *obeys himself*.

The words of Pius X condemning the "consensual" authority of the *Sillon* take on the fullness of their value against this seditious attempt of Maritain's political social philosophy.

Is this, Venerable Brethren," says the Pope, "the way in which the traditional doctrine of the Church represents to us the social relations in the city, even if it is supposed to be more perfect? Does not every society of men who are independent and unequal by nature need an authority to direct the action of all to the common good and to impose its law? And if there are evil beings in society (and there always will be), must not authority be all the stronger the more threatening the selfishness of the wicked? Moreover, can it be said, with even a shadow of reason, that the

³⁸⁸ *El Pueblo*, 13/V/1945.

³⁸⁹ *Principes d'une politique humaniste*, p. 63.

³⁹⁰ *Christ. et Dém.* p. 59; English ed. p. 64.

Can it be taught that obedience is contrary to human dignity and that the ideal would be to replace it with "consented authority"? Did not the Apostle Paul have in mind human society in all its possible states when he prescribed to the faithful submission to all authority? Does obedience to men, as legitimate representatives of God, that is, in short, obedience to God, lower man and bring him down below himself?

Or is it that the religious state founded on obedience will be contrary to the ideal of human nature? Or that the Saints, who have been the most obedient of men, will have been slaves and degenerates? Can one imagine, finally, a social state where Jesus Christ, returned to earth, would no longer give an example of obedience or say, Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's?"

And note how accurately the pontifical word hits the sore spot of the Maritainian error when it speaks of "social relations in the city, however perfect it may be supposed to be" and of "human society in all its possible states" as if to reprove this attempt at a *new city with consensual authority in response* to a *new law* that has arisen in the human person through a "new awareness. No. The law of the Christian city is not consented authority; the law of the Christian city is the temporal common good subordinated to the eternal, it is the city resting on the rights of God, because the city must direct man towards the living and true God. And those who govern are not to seek the flattery of the crowds, they are not to seek their consent, but they are to seek the divine will and law, because their obligations are to be measured by the *common good* which is regulated by divine measures and not by the whims of the crowd. Moreover, who forms public opinion in modern societies, who is the driving force behind the passive and inert crowds that would not be agitated if there were no one to stir them up? What do the people breathe if not what propaganda provides them with? And who manages the propaganda but the mysterious holders of banking, of opinion, of international interests? What does this chimerical pretension of a *self-governing* multitude lead to if not to handing over all the peoples of the world to obscure international forces which, moving and agitating from the shadows, the conflicting appetites of the popular masses, break the resistance of the people?

How can we make it possible to impose on the universe the "legal reign of force and cunning"?

Do we then maintain, some will ask, that it is necessary to govern against the consent of the multitude, against public opinion? No, precisely; because, especially today, when international secret societies hold effective public power, this would make it impossible to maintain the power that would be proposed. But we hold, yes, that it is only to be taught as Catholic truth that the *common good* is the law of the city to which the people must submit, even if they do not like it; we also hold that only on this basis can a people be happy and that if the case should arise in which it were so anarchized and convulsed that it could not endure its fulfillment, it would be a perverted and unhappy people, with no other fate than to languish in anarchy or to surrender itself as a slave to a cunning and strong master. But the *facts* never authorize the alteration of the *law* or of the judgment of value. For this reason the *Syllabus* condemns proposition 59 which says that "all human facts have the force of law".

Marc Sangnier, who does not generally enter into such abstruse explanations as those attempted by Maritain in *Principes d' une politique humaniste*, says with more frankness and clarity: "We are and we want to remain free men. We know that there can exist a society of free men who will not be bound together by the fear of cannons or of the sergeants of the city or by a tyrannical and impotent legality...if all of us would recognize this, ah, I assure you, free obedience voluntarily consented to would become the most wonderful act of freedom because to obey one must be free. A beast does not obey, it follows its instinct. Man can obey, but he descends below the beast if he obeys lower passions and rises to divinity if he accepts authority as an emanation of Christ"³⁹¹ .

Pius X faithfully summarizes the Maritainian theory and that of the *Sillon* in these words: "For one thing, in politics, the *Sillon* does not abolish authority; on the contrary, he considers it indispensable; but he wants to divide it, or rather to multiply it in such a way that each citizen becomes a kind of king. Authority, it is true, comes from God; but it resides primarily in the people, from whom it is derived by way of election or, better still, by selection, without

³⁹¹ *Discours*, I, pp. 328.

that for this reason it will be separate from the people and independent of them; it will be external, but only in appearance; in reality it will be internal, because it will be a consented authority".

Authority communicated by the people

Catholic liberals do not profess Rousseau's monstrous delirium that public authority "comes from the people, so that those who exercise civil authority do not exercise it as their own, but as a mandate or commission from the people"³⁹² ; They accept that, as such, authority comes from God, but in a forced and distorted application of the famous doctrine of the ancient scholastics, defended by Bellarmine and Suarez against James I of England on the primitive origin of the form in which power is exercised and of the subject who holds it, they want to use this doctrine to grant some privileges to democracy and to establish a *constant passage of authority by the people*. Lamennais defended this theory that deserved very bitter censures from Father Ventura³⁹³ ; the *Sillon* also defended it and Maritain now resumes it. Maritainian democracy "does not recognize only that the prince governs as representing in his person the whole people, *ut vices gerens multitudinis*; what properly constitutes it as democracy is that it makes this vicariousness the typical law of its authoritarian structure, so that *authority passing through the people rises from degree to degree, from the base to the top of the hierarchical structure of the community* and that the exercise of power by men in whom the designation of the people periodically makes authority reside, implies the *constancy of the passage of this authority through the multitude*"³⁹⁴ . Thus, in Maritainian democracy, this passage of authority through the people constitutes an essential note of the justice of authority, which, in the event of its absence, detaches the individual from obedience. Society would then be constituted in a permanent state of sedition. But let us not get ahead of ourselves. Let us confine ourselves now to ascertaining how exactly the reflections of Pius X apply to it.

³⁹² Leo XIII, *Diuturnum*.

³⁹³ An article from *L'Avenir* of 12/II/1831, in *Oeuvres Completes*, by F. De La Mennais, Bruxelles, 1839, t. II, p. 442.

³⁹⁴ *Principes d'une politique humaniste*, p. 67.

"The *Sillon* primarily places public authority in the people, from whom it is then derived to the rulers, in such a way, however, that it continues to reside in them. But Leo XIII formally condemned this doctrine in his encyclical *Diuturnum illud*, on the political Principality, when he says:

"Many moderns, following in the footsteps of those who in the last century claimed the name of philosophers, affirm that all power comes from the people, so that those who exercise it in society do not exercise it in their own right, but by delegation of the people and with the express condition of being revocable by the will of the same people who conferred it on them. Entirely contrary is the feeling of Catholics who derive from God the right to command, as from its natural and necessary principle". No doubt the *Sillon* makes this authority descend from God, which he places first in the people; but in such a way that "it rises from below to go upwards, while in the organization of the Church the power descends from above to go downwards". But disregarding the anomaly of a delegation that goes up, when by its condition it is natural that it should go down, Leo XIII refuted beforehand this attempt to reconcile Catholic doctrine with the error of philosophism. For he continues: "It is important to note in this place that the supreme rulers can in certain cases be elected by the will and decision of the people, without this being contradicted or repugnant to Catholic doctrine. Although this election designates the prince, it does not confer upon him the rights of the principality, nor does it delegate the power, but it determines by whom it is to be exercised".

Maritain uses the same words of Marc Sangnier's speech in Rouen in 1907, from which he quotes the pontifical document and in a note he wants to prevent the error condemned by the Pope, saying that authority "is not conferred on its holders by the choice of the multitude but by the very Source of being and of all nature". "But the very designation," he adds, "to the holders of authority by the people, involves the *passage of this right by the people*"³⁹⁵. The dialectical filigree of the *sedition* philosopher cannot stand. For if authority passes through the people, it is in the people at least when it passes; and if this passage is *constant*, as he affirms, authority is in the people *constantly*; which is, on the other hand, what³⁹⁶ teaches when it says: "Democracy wants the

³⁹⁵ Ibid., pp. 68 and 69.

³⁹⁶ Ibid., pp. 67 ff.

authority and power coming from the people and exercised on their behalf and with them". Hence, when a ruler, even a prudent and saintly man elected in clean popular elections, has fallen into the disgrace of the lodges, the latter have only to give orders to the pack of agitators, who will move the people and the people will revoke the mandate. In the Maritainian democracy sedition is the law of the city, unless the ruler is a docile puppet of the international forces.

Like all liberals, Maritain does not fail to invoke the authority of Suarez and Bellarmine to support his thesis. It is picturesque that Maritain, who never distinguished himself for his devotion to the eminent Doctor, turns to his works in search of arguments for *sedition*. It is clear that in order to do so, they must have distorted the thought of the great theologian who could never have imagined that Catholics would use him as the standard-bearer of Christian democratism. Suarez speaks only of the *first* origin of authority in a political community; he considers the community as a hierarchically functioning structure with diverse and harmonized social classes, and not as a "mass of workers" into which the Maritainian city is to become, as we shall see later; he does not pretend consent as an *explicit* manifestation on the basis of universal suffrage but as *usual adhesion*, given to power, when the community feels well governed. For them the *supreme law of the city* is the common good and not the popular will or consent. Therefore, for Suarez and Bellarmine, as for all theologians, monarchy is the best form of government, although the others can justly be admitted, provided they effectively procure the common good of the city. Thus Suarez says: "By virtue of natural law men are not obliged to choose determinately between one of these modes of government: because, although among them monarchy is the best, as Aristotle shows at length and can be deduced from the government and providence of the whole universe, which must be the best, whence Aristotle concluded (*Metaphysics*, XII, at the end), that monarchy is, saying: *Therefore the prince is only one*. The same is shown by the example of Christ our Lord in the institution and government of his Church: and lastly the same is shown by the most frequent use of nations; and even if this be so, yet other modes of government are not bad, but may be good and useful, and for this reason by virtue of the pure law of nature are not the

men bound to have this power in one, or in several, or in the collection of all"³⁹⁷ .

Rejection of paternalistic authority

Maritain considers incongruous to the dignity of the human person that one commands another paternalistically. Democracy "excludes," he says, "the paternalistic domination of a social category (be it priest, king, nobleman, sage, bourgeois) over the mass of the people considered as a minor, and demands that an essential parity in the common condition of men dedicated to work be at the basis of the relations of authority and of the hierarchy of temporal functions, whether it is a question of political authority or of another kind of social authority. In this "*homogeneous*" conception of temporal authority, the chief is a partner who has the right to command others"³⁹⁸ .

Maritain does not explain how this aversion to paternalism is reconciled with the words of Gregory XVI, in the *Mirari Vos* when he condemns Lamennais who no longer admitted what he called *real paternity*. "Since they have been constituted

-Gregory XVI says of rulers - as fathers and tutors of the people....."; and with the words of Leo XIII in *Immortale Dei*: "So just must be the mandate and empire that rulers exercise, and not despotic, but in a certain way *paternal*, because the most just power that God has over men is also united with his goodness as a Father"; nor does it appear how this desire to lower authority contributes to give political power "as great strength, dignity and firmness as the defense of the republic and the common utilities of the citizens require"³⁹⁹ .

Suffrage, a natural right

But what entails a more serious deviation from Catholic doctrine on the equal status of justice of each form of government is the following

³⁹⁷ Tractatus de Legibus, 1. III, c. IV.

³⁹⁸ Principes d'une politique humaniste, p. 69.

³⁹⁹ Leo XIII, *Diuturnum*.

which is based on the *natural* right of the human person to the exercise of suffrage, that is, what is called universal suffrage as an inalienable right. Consequently, if this is so, democracy is the only legitimate form, or, at least, it enjoys a *special privilege* over the others, as the most just, since universal suffrage represents an "absolutely fundamental political and human value". Maritain says: "The famous phrase of Aristotle, which says that man is a political animal, does not only mean that man is naturally made to live in society; it also means that man naturally claims to lead a political life, and to participate actively in the life of the political community. *Political liberties and political rights, and especially the right of suffrage, rest upon this postulate of human nature.* Perhaps it is easier for men to renounce active participation in political life; it may have happened that in certain cases they have lived more carefree and happier by being like political slaves in the city, or by passively abandoning to their chiefs all the care of directing the life of the community. *But they abandon then a privilege which suits their nature, one of those privileges which, in a sense, make life harder and bring with them more or less toil, strain and suffering, but which correspond to human dignity.*"

"A state of civilization in which men, as individuals, designate by free choice those in charge of authority is in itself a more perfect state. For if it is true that the essential function of political authority is to direct free men towards the common good, it is normal that these free men should choose for themselves who will have the function of directing them: this is the most elementary form of active participation in political life. *For this reason universal suffrage, by which every adult human person has, as such, the right to pronounce himself on the affairs of the community, by casting his vote in the election of the representatives of the people and of the leaders of the State, has an absolutely fundamental political and human value, and is one of the rights which a community of free men could never renounce*"⁴⁰⁰ .

It is convenient to point out "the emphatic language, taken from the rhetoric of the worst enemies of the Church", as Pius X says in the *Sillon*, which Maritain likes to use, with his nomenclature of "political slave". So St. Thomas and St. John of the Cross, who did not have the right to "political and

⁴⁰⁰ *Les Droits*, p. 105; English ed. p. 134.

absolutely fundamental human" of universal suffrage were "political slaves", "politically diminished", and the political being human, humanly diminished?

There is no difficulty in conceding that *a certain participation of the people* in political life can be very convenient and can contribute to social peace⁴⁰¹, participation that can consist in the meeting of the general states, for the acceptance of new laws and charges, as it happened in the medieval monarchies, or also in the active participation of the multitude in the government, to the extent that the common good of the city consents it; But to demand it by virtue of a *natural* right, and therefore unrenounceable without detriment to one's own perfection, does not appear to be in accord with the doctrine of the Church, which forbids granting special privileges to democracy over other forms of government. Hence the censure of Pius X in the *Sillon* suits the Maritainian theory:

"Likewise democracy is the only one which, according to him, will inaugurate the reign of perfect justice: but is this not an insult to the other forms of government, which are thus lowered to the condition of impotent governments, suffering only for lack of anything better? Moreover, the *Sillon* also stumbles on this point with the teachings of Leo XIII. He could have read in the Encyclical already cited of the political Principality that, "save justice, it is not forbidden to peoples to give themselves the government which corresponds best to their character or to the institutions and customs which they received from their ancestors". Now; since the Encyclical refers to the well-known threefold form of government, it assumes, by the same token, that justice is compatible with each of them. For does not the Encyclical on the condition of workers clearly affirm the possibility of restoring justice in the present organizations of society, since it indicates the means? But since, no doubt, Leo XIII wished to speak, not of any justice, but of perfect justice, in teaching that justice is compatible with the three known forms of government, he also taught that, on this side, *democracy does not enjoy a special privilege*. The *sillonists*, who claim that

⁴⁰¹ Julio Meinvielle, *Concepción Católica de la Política*, Ediciones Theoria, Buenos Aires, 1961, pp. 100 and 108.

On the contrary, they either refuse to listen to the Church, or they form of justice and equality a concept that is not Catholic."

But this pretension of Maritain's to erect universal suffrage as a requirement of natural law contains a monstrous aberration. For it is evident that the foundation of a *human political society* rests on an organic social structure. This is admirably stated by the author of Book IV, Chapter 23 of the *Regiment of Princes*. "Thus it happens," he says, "in a true and perfect republic as with the well-disposed human body, in which the organic forces are in perfect vigor. And if the supreme virtue, which is reason, directs the other lower powers, which are moved according to its rule, then a certain smoothness and reciprocal delight of the forces is produced, which we call harmony. Whence St. Augustine says in Book III of the *City of God* that the republic or city well disposed is comparable to the melodies of the voices in which by the proportion of the various sounds reciprocally harmonized among themselves, there results the soft singing, delightful to the ears. . . For a true city or republic requires that the members conform to the head, that they do not disagree with each other, and that all things be arranged in the city. . . Then there is a perfect society when each one, in his state, has the proper disposition and operation". Thus it was thought and lived in the ages in which man, without having suffered the exorbitance of his being by the proclamation of the rights of the human person, understood that *the good of the social whole* was the *first* good of each of the parts and, consequently, it was not thought to erect in *natural law* applied to all human communities in the universe the universal suffrage - so many votes, so many heads - essentially disintegrating of the organic joints of the social body. What is universal suffrage if not the instrument with which the social organism is kept perpetually divided, fragmented, pulverized? Why this state of perpetual sedition in which the country is in a state of perpetual sedition? society, since the days of the great Revolution? And how does Maritain intend to establish a regime of collective welfare - welfare that is measured not in relation to stomachs but in relation to the divine good for which man was created - on the basis of this disintegrating instrument erected as a fundamental right?

Pius IX gave a famous definition of universal suffrage when, on May 5, 1874, speaking to French pilgrims, he told them: *Universal suffrage is a universal lie*⁴⁰². Maritain who works for the Revolution, against the Gospel, elevates it to the category of divine natural right.

The reason is clear; it wants to destroy the organic social structure; it wants a leveling and egalitarian society. For this reason, not content to corrupt civil life with universal suffrage, he wants to corrupt social life. Let us see how he exposes the exclusion of *hétérogénique* domination in the economic sphere.

Economic emancipation

"Another great cause of the failure of modern democracies - writes Maritain⁴⁰³ - to realize democracy is the fact that this realization ineluctably demanded to be fulfilled both in the social and in the political order and that this demand was not satisfied". This opinion is so common that it has reached the street in the language of Christian democrats of all countries and epochs.

Let us see, then, how Maritain conceives this democracy in the *social sphere*. In *Les Droits de L'Homme* he explains it sufficiently when referring to *Les Droits de la Personne Ouvrière*⁴⁰⁴.

Progress of workers' consciousness

Maritain maintains first of all that the progress of the organization and the progress of consciousness are two simultaneous progresses. In what does this *awareness* consist? It is the awareness," he writes, "of an offended and humiliated human dignity, and the awareness of the mission of the working world in modern history. It means the ascent towards freedom and personality, taken in its inner reality and in its

⁴⁰² Dom Paul Benoit, *La cité antichrétienne, Les erreurs modernes*, II, p. 562.

⁴⁰³ *Christ. et Dém.* p. 32; English ed. p. 34.

⁴⁰⁴ *Les Droits*, pp. 114-135; English ed. pp. 141-158.

social expression, of a community of persons, of the community, at once the closest to the material bases of human life, and the most sacrificed, the community of manual labor, the community of human persons engaged in this work". With identical words he expresses himself in his *Humanisme Intégral*⁴⁰⁵. Marc Sangnier will say for his part: "Democracy is the conscious and responsible people, guardian not only of their personal interests but of the interest of the State and capable, since then, of taking more and more care of the affairs of the country. . . It is above all and above all an increase in civic life, an intellectual and moral emancipation, more and more detached from the bonds of servitude of body and spirit"⁴⁰⁶.

Maritain then, like Marc Sangnier, claims for the working class the rank of director of social and political life. This progress of working class consciousness entails the recognition that the working mass, the people, has come of age and therefore not only does not admit the tutelage of other social classes, but also claims the direction of social life. "If the proletariat asks to be treated as an older person, by the same token it should not be helped, *improved*, or saved by another social class. On the contrary, to it and to its movement of historical ascent belongs the main mission in the next phase of evolution"⁴⁰⁷.

How should the proletariat, conscious of its social principality, fulfill the responsibility it demands? It is not, however," replies Maritain, "by distancing itself from the rest of the community in order to exercise a class dictatorship, as Marxism would have it, that the working and peasant people must play this inspiring and renewing role. But by organizing and educating itself, becoming aware of its responsibilities in the community and uniting to its work all the elements of any class to which they belong, determined to work with him for human freedom"⁴⁰⁸. This progress of workers' consciousness, thus broadly understood and with universal social projections, had been emphasized by Marc

⁴⁰⁵ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 246.

⁴⁰⁶ *La lutte pour la démocratie*, p. 41.

⁴⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 116.

⁴⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

Sangnier in his movement of the *Sillon*, and had been qualified with the name of "*un renversement de valeurs*" corresponding to the destruction of the egoistic and pagan edifice on whose present social ruin the future city will be built"⁴⁰⁹ . "Let us speak even more clearly; in his judgments, the *Sillon* operates as a transtrade of values. We do not believe, in fact, that the old ruling classes as a whole, that the bourgeoisie, that those who have entered the liberal professions, are capable of guiding our country in the direction of its true destiny. We believe that health must be sought elsewhere and in other ways"⁴¹⁰ .

Both what Maritain and Marc Sangnier write is linked to what Hubert Lagardelle, "leader" of the socialist party, maintains in *Le Mouvement socialiste*⁴¹¹ (February 1911, quoted by Barbier, IV, 401): "The shift of values, as well as the intervention of values or factors, means, in the thinking of those who use these expressions, that the worker must, from now on, come to the fore, that the boss must no longer appear but in the background. The "Third-State, said Sièyes, is nothing, it must be everything"; now it is said: "the worker was nothing in industry; he must be everything"".

Therefore, no *tutelage*, no paternalism. And in this, "*Les démocrates chrétiens*", Marc Sangnier and Maritain are in full agreement. "In our opinion - said Abbé Naudet⁴¹² -, the conception of a social class in charge of saving another is a conception as false as it is anti-democratic". Marc Sangnier for his part writes: "We will not accept the gift of a good tyrant who would pour upon us the manna of proletarian reforms; we claim to be the very artisans of our social elevation and to be able to develop in ourselves the integrity of our life as citizens, the integrity of our whole life"⁴¹³ .

Maritain, for his part, writes: "The temptation that comes from the ancient conceptions once in vogue in certain Christian circles is the

⁴⁰⁹ *Discours*, I, p. 262.

⁴¹⁰ *Le Sillon*, 10/X/1905.

⁴¹¹ Quoted by E. Barbier, vol. IV, p. 401.

⁴¹² Abbé Naudet, *La Démocratie et les démocrates chrétiens*, p. 65.

⁴¹³ *Discours*, t. I, p. 339, quoted by Barbier, IV, p. 395.

temptation of paternalism which tends to make the improvement of the lot of the working class depend on the initiatives of the employers and on their authority as parents conscious of their duties towards their children. Such a conception tends to treat the worker as a minor, and is most radically opposed to this awareness of the social dignity and rights of the working person on which we have insisted so much"⁴¹⁴ .

Suppression of social classes

Once the transfer of values referred to above has been fully effected, the future City that will result from it, truly democratic and proletarian, will not admit in its midst any social *classes*. In this the Christian democrats, the Sillonists and Maritain also coincide perfectly, as they also coincide with the socialists and communists. Let us limit ourselves to Marc Sangnier's parallelism with Maritain. "The *Sillon* wants to realize among all, without distinction of trade or social means and outside of all narrow and evil-doing conventions an active and militant comradeship"⁴¹⁵ .

In the congress of the Vth district on the democratic spirit it is also discussed if there will be "classes" in democracy: it is necessary, says someone, a *moral* equality. Marc Sangnier protested: "*it is not only a question of a theoretical equality*, it is necessary to make pass in the customs all that can pass from the Christian ideas"⁴¹⁶ . Another of his best followers, Gemalhing, will write: "This division of men into classes, or into professions is an ancient conception that can be accepted in a monarchical organization, but it can only survive in a democracy to the extent that all these bodies are dominated by the general interest and oriented towards it"⁴¹⁷ . Maritain pointed out as early as 1932⁴¹⁸ : "The society of which we speak would in fact be a society "*sans classes*", i.e., from where the differences between classes as our Western civilization has known them up to the present day would have been erased.

⁴¹⁴ *Les Droits*, p. 122; English ed. p. 149.

⁴¹⁵ *Le Sillon*, 2/VIII/1904.

⁴¹⁶ *Compte rendu del Sillon*, 25/VII/1904, cited by Barbier, IV, p. 399.

⁴¹⁷ *El Sillon*, 18/II/1907, quoted *ibid*.

⁴¹⁸ *Du régime temporel et de la liberté*, p. 67.

present, classes founded above all, in another time on the transmission of blood, in the modern world on money".

But neither Maritain nor Marc Sangnier suppress any hierarchy: "It is obviously not the idea of a social hierarchy that we criticize here, but the egoistic conception of this hierarchy"⁴¹⁹. And Maritain will write: "But new differences would unfailingly occur within this people of human persons all similarly placed in the condition of "workers" because there is no order without diversity and inequality of degrees; and in a world in which the social values would be first of all function, not of the birth nor of the wealth, but of the work, the chiefs that would be designated in all the degrees the diverse social organs would constitute a true popular aristocracy, *tenue d' aussi près* to the service of the community by the same object of its function, and without a doubt as imperious, jealous of honor and freedom as the old hereditary and military aristocracy"⁴²⁰. And: "If otherwise the present division into classes must be overcome, this society without bourgeoisie and without proletariat would not be a society without internal structure and without organic differentiations or inequality". Maritain teaches neither more nor less than what the *Sillon* taught; consequently, the censure of Pius X suits him perfectly when he says: "In effect, the *Sillon* proposes the improvement and regeneration of the working classes. But on this matter the principles of Catholic doctrine are already fixed, and there is the history of Christian civilization to testify to its fruitfulness. Our Predecessor, of f. m., recalled them in masterly pages, which Catholics applied to social questions should always study and keep in mind. He taught especially that Christian democracy must "maintain the diversity of classes, certainly proper to a well-constituted society, and desire for human society that form and condition which God, its author, taught it". He anathematized a "certain democracy whose perversity goes so far as to attribute sovereignty in society to the people and to seek the suppression and leveling of classes". At the same time, Leo XIII imposed on Catholics the only program of action capable of restoring and maintaining society on its secular Christian foundations. Now, what have the leaders of the

⁴¹⁹ *Démocratie et hiérarchie in L'esprit démocratique*, p. 150.

⁴²⁰ *Du régime temporel et de la liberté*, p. 67.

Chair? Not only have they adopted a program and a teaching different from those of Leo XIII (and it would be singular audacity on the part of laymen to set themselves up as directors of the social activity of the Church in competition with the Sovereign Pontiff), but they have openly rejected the program outlined by Leo XIII, adopting another diametrically opposed to it. Besides this, discarding the doctrine recalled by Leo XIII about the essential principles of society, they place authority in the people or almost suppress it, and have as a realizable ideal the leveling of classes. They go, then, contrary to Catholic doctrine, towards a condemned ideal"⁴²¹ .

Abolition of the system of patronage and salaried employees

If the social classes based on blood or money are to be abolished from society in order to arrive at a world of workers, the regime of the wage-earner and therefore the regime of patronage must be abolished or at least we must tend towards their elimination. Marc Sangnier will say: "We want then, comrades, to develop in the French working class milieus, enough consciousness, enough vital energy so that they find themselves as holders of influence and powers, which will no longer be reserved to a caste or to a closed class.... You will feel, from then on, that this *patronage*, that this *salariat*, against which the socialists and revolutionaries are uselessly irritated, will tend to disappear and to be modified the day that we have created in the brains of the proletarians this living force that will allow them to assume all the responsibilities because they will be sufficiently conscious"⁴²² .

"...We feel better and better that the *capitalist regime* and that the wage rate are not eternal"⁴²³ .

"Now, cooperation seems to us to second and increase this democratic ascent, because it adopts a *method of freedom*, because it proposes to individuals to become great not *in solidarity*, but *fraternally*, because by suppressing *profit*, it tends to suppress *the exploitation of man by the*

⁴²¹ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 216.

⁴²² *Discours*, t. I, p. 300.

⁴²³ *Le Sillon*, 10/I/1905.

424 For his part, Maritain writes: "Other rights will undoubtedly be recognized for labor by human law as the economic regime is transformed. There is reason to think that in the types of enterprise in which it is possible, a system of co-ownership and co-management of labor will replace the wage system and that with the progress of economic organization a new right will be formed for the technically and socially qualified worker: the right to what can be called the *title of work*, which assures man that his employment belongs to him, binding his person by a juridical bond, and that in it he will be able to progress his operative activity. Let us be quite sure that after the present war, which represents a world revolutionary crisis, the social and economic conditions of human life, the regime of property and the regime of production will be profoundly and irrevocably changed, and that the present privilege of wealth will in any case yield its place to a new system of life, better or worse depending on whether its animating principle is the personalist spirit or the totalitarian spirit. The difficulty for thought is to be as bold to understand as the facts are to produce"⁴²⁵ .

Maritain calls for a more humane regime in which the *responsibility of working human beings* is given place. The *Sillon* affirmed no other thing. We read in *Le Vraies idées du Sillon*: "We criticize first of all the present organization of the patronage and the salary: it represents in our eyes the defect of concentrating on the head of some, often perhaps most of the benefits, but *above all what is most human, most moralizing in work*: initiative, foresight *and above all responsibility*. It is urgent, it seems to us, to remedy this serious disorder that compromises at the same time the *dignity* of the worker. And I think that the stability of the French industry proves it enough. But, it will be said to us: do you want then to suppress the bosses? We will be careful. *Provisionally*, they are the necessary organs of *production*. In our society as it is and as the workers are, the bosses are as indispensable to national life as our brain or our stomach to our bodily life. *We want only to prepare for the advent*

⁴²⁴ Ibid., 10/X/1907.

⁴²⁵ *Les Droits*, p. 117; English ed. p. 141.

of a better economic regime, of a more rational and more humane regime, in which there will not exist *the unpleasant divorce between industrial responsibility and labor*. For this two things are necessary: that we first find the precise and concrete forms, we would willingly say the formulas of these new organs of production; secondly, to *raise the proletarian conscience to the height of its new responsibilities*"⁴²⁶ . Maritain writes: "...the notion of collectivization should give place to that of societal ownership of the means of production or of co-ownership in enterprises. With the exception of certain sectors of completely general interest, whose transformation into public services is normal, it will be a societal regime, substituting as much as possible *co-ownership* for the salaried worker, which, in a conception of this nature, and in what concerns above all the industrial plan, should succeed the capitalist regime; the worker personnel would thus participate in the management of the enterprise, for which, moreover, modern technical progress allows us to hope for a certain decentralization"⁴²⁷ . "When we speak of the corporate form of industrial property, we speak of a company of persons (management technicians, workers, suppliers) entirely different from the capital companies which could give rise, under the conditions of the current regime, to the notion of co-ownership; and it is a company of persons in which the co-ownership of the private enterprise, engaged in an organized "community of labor", would be the guarantee of the "work title" to which we referred above, and would result in the constitution and development of a common patrimony"⁴²⁸ . "It is essential in any case to understand that any organization of the economy on a structural and cooperative principle must be conceived as being established *from the bottom up*, according to the principles of personalist democracy, with suffrage and active personal participation of all the interests at the base and as emanating from them and their unions"⁴²⁹ .

At summary that if Marc Sangnier speaks of a "harmonic harmonic state equivalent to state collectivist state" ⁴³⁰ ,
 "Maritain speaks also of the

⁴²⁶ *Le Sillon*, quoted by Barbier, IV, p. 403.

⁴²⁷ *Les Droits*, p. 121; English ed. p. 148.

⁴²⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 124; English ed., p. 150.

⁴³⁰ *Le Sillon*, 25/VII/1904.

"harmonious cohabitation" that the pluralist principle applied . . . to the different economic structures must produce within the temporal community"⁴³¹ .

Suppression of all easements

The tendency of the Sillonist theory as that of Maritain is directed to the suppression of all servitude or economic subjection because "the advent of Democracy" coincides with "the emancipation of the proletariat"⁴³² . Maritain states: "The fundamental right of the working person is not only opposed to slavery properly speaking, it also entails an aspiration or a vow opposed to *servitude understood in its most general sense*, that is to say, to this form of *authority of man over man* in which the one who is directed is not to the *common good* by the chief charged with this office, but to the particular service of the one who directs him, thus alienating his activity and ceding to another the good (fruit of his activity) that should be his own, in other words, becoming the organ of another person"⁴³³ . The *Sillon*, for his part, advocated, for the same reasons, the suppression of domestic service: "I would still insist on the exceptional, disturbing and, let us say it frankly, immoral character of an institution that places a person entirely under the dependence of another person, without being required by a higher purpose. Such a bond deserves to be called *lien de servage*"⁴³⁴ . "The emancipation of the proletariat," says the *Sillon*, "will come out of the efforts of the proletarian himself"⁴³⁵ . And Maritain: "The contrarian progress of humanity goes in the direction of *human emancipation*, not only in the political order, but also in the *economic and social*, so that *the various forms of servitude*, by which *a man is at the service of another man*, for the particular good of the latter, and as an organ of the latter, are little by little abolished as human history approaches its end. This presupposes not only the passage to better states of organization, but also the passage to a better awareness of the dignity of the human person in every human being.

⁴³¹ Ibid., p. 127; English ed., p. 152.

⁴³² *La lutte de la Démocratie*, p. 182.

⁴³³ *Les Droits*, p. 130; English ed. p. 154.

⁴³⁴ Quoted by Barbier, IV, 404.

⁴³⁵ *L'Univers*, 12/IV/1905.

one of us, and of the primacy of fraternal love among all **t h e** values of our life"⁴³⁶ .

Pius X's summary of the *Sillon's* thought fits perfectly into the Maritainian democracy at this point: "In proportion will happen the same thing in the economic order. Subtracted from a particular class, patronage will multiply so much that each worker will be a kind of patron. The form called upon to realize this economic ideal will not be, they say, that of socialism, but a system of cooperatives sufficiently multiplied to provoke a fruitful concurrence and to assure the independence of the workers, who will not be chained to any of them." "The future city for which he is striving will have neither masters, nor servants, the citizens will be all free, all comrades, all kings." "We already know that they flatter themselves to raise the human dignity and the condition, too much despised of the working classes; to see to it that the laws of labor and the relations between capital and wage earners are just and perfect; to make reign, finally, on earth a better justice and greater charity; and to promote in humanity, with deep and fruitful social movements, an unexpected progress. We certainly do not condemn these efforts, which would be by all accounts excellent if the Sillonists did not forget that the progress of a being consists in invigorating his natural faculties with new forces and in facilitating the exercise of his activity within the limits and laws of his constitution; but that if, on the contrary, his essential organs are injured and the limits of his activity are violated, he is pushed, not towards progress, but towards death. This, however, is what they wish to make of human society; their dream consists in changing its natural and traditional foundations and in promising a future city built on other principles which they dare to declare more fruitful, more beneficial than those on which the present Christian society rests."

The leadership of society in the working class

Maritain, starting from the fact of the *class struggle* that seems to constitute the law of modern societies and from the fact, on the point of taking

⁴³⁶ *Les Droits*, p. 133; English ed. p. 157.

In order to justify this double fact, which does not seem regrettable to him; what does seem bad to him is that it should take place in the name of a communist ideology; he then wants to *baptize it*, so that it will take place in the name of the Gospel: the Social Revolution will be Christian and the work of Christians. And in a chimerical sentimental expansion, he intends to bring about a revolution that will be more revolutionary than the Revolution⁴³⁷. To this end, he advocates the acceleration of the process of emancipation, that is, of social dissolution, in the expectation that the new Christianity elaborated by his *preclari cives* will result from it. But his attempt, as Pius X wisely warned about the *Sillon*: "*goes against Catholic doctrine, towards a condemned ideal*". Catholic doctrine, which on this point does nothing more than consolidate the principles of natural law, places the solution of the social problem, not in a utopian leveling of classes, not in the suppression of patronage, but in a *collaboration of different social classes* helping each other on the basis of the virtue of justice strengthened by Christian charity. Hence Leo XIII in *Rerum Novarum*, which Christian democrats unwittingly use as the Catholic Charter of Social Revolution, points out the duties of workers and employers, saying: "And in the first place, the whole of the teachings of religion, of which the Church is the interpreter and depositary, can do much to bring the rich and the proletarians closer together and unite them, because it teaches both their mutual duties and especially those which flow from justice. Of these duties, those that concern the proletarian and the worker are: to do his part fully and faithfully in the work that has been freely and equitably contracted; not to harm capital in any way, nor to do personal violence to his masters; in defending his own rights, to abstain from force and never to form seditions or join forces with evil men who cunningly place before them excessive hopes and great promises, from which almost always follows a useless repentance and the ruin of their fortunes".

And in the *Quod apostolici muneris* of December 28, 1878, after explaining the cause of the rebellion of the needy, the Pope stated that

⁴³⁷ *Lettre sur l'indépendance*, deux. éd., p. 65.

is the name, stripped of rhetoric, that suits the *Maritainian prise de conscience*, after noting how the Popes, since Clement XII, "sought to avert in time the danger..." "that the clandestine societies in whose bosom the seeds" of the said *prise de conscience de la personne ouvrière* were already then being fostered, *he* establishes the just principles that are to regulate the *action*, let it be understood, the concrete action of Catholics, even if they were philosophers. However, although the socialists," says the Pope, "abusing the Gospel itself to more easily deceive **t h e** unwary, are accustomed to twist them to their opinion, yet there is so great a difference between their perverse dogmas and the purest doctrine of Christ that it cannot be greater. For what participation can there be of righteousness with iniquity, or what consortium of light with darkness? They surely do not cease to vociferate, as we have intimated, that all men are among themselves by nature equal, and, therefore, hold that neither honor and reverence are due to majesty nor to laws, unless perchance those sanctioned by them at their discretion." "On the contrary, according to the teachings of the Gospel, the equality of men consists in the fact that all, having been endowed with the same nature, are called to the same high dignity as children of God, and at the same time that, since the same end is decreed for all, each one must be judged according to the same law in order to obtain, according to his merits, either punishment or reward. But the inequality of right and power are from the same Author of nature, *by whom is appointed all fatherhood in the heavens, and on earth.*"⁴³⁸ . "Also to servants and lords is proposed, through the same apostle, the divine precept that the former should *obey their carnal lords as Christ, serving him with good will as the Lord; but to the latter, that they should omit threatening, knowing that the Lord of all is in heaven, and that there is no respect of persons with God*"⁴³⁹ .

"All which things, if they were carefully guarded, according to the good pleasure of the divine will, by all those whom they touch, surely every family would represent the image of heaven, and the prelates

⁴³⁸ Ephesians, III, 15.

⁴³⁹ Ibid., VI, 5-9.

The benefits that would follow from this would not be enclosed within monastic walls, but would flow abundantly to the republics themselves.

"She commands, moreover, that the right of ownership and dominion, which comes from nature itself, be kept intact and inviolate in the hands of those who possess it, because she knows that theft and robbery have been condemned in the law of nature by God, the author and guardian of every right, to such an extent that it is not lawful even to desire the goods of others, and that thieves, as well as adulterers and idol-worshippers, are excluded from the kingdom of heaven. Not for this reason, however, does she forget the cause of the poor, nor does it happen that the pious Mother neglects to provide for their needs, but, on the contrary, she embraces them in her bosom with maternal affection, and considering that they represent the person of Christ, who receives as made to Himself the goods granted even to the last of the poor, she honors them greatly and in every possible way sustains them; He is solicitous to build houses and hospices everywhere, where they are taken in, fed and cared for, taking them under his guardianship".

The principles of social order of the Roman Pontiff go *in another direction*, towards the *collaboration of different classes*, from that to which Maritain's *prise de conscience ouvrière* leads. And when, at the beginning of the century, the wave of socialist revolution swept the Catholic camp, Pope Pius X, in the famous *motu proprio* of December 18, 1903, promulgated a compendium of the norms that should guide the action of Catholics in their social activity. Maritain, who claims to be a philosopher of the Incarnation, will have to explain to us how he reconciles his *revolutionary* philosophy with the following points *prescribed* by the Pontifical Authority.

I. - Human society, as God established it, consists of *unequal elements*, as *unequal are the members of the human body*; to make them all equal is impossible; the ruin of society itself would follow". (*Quod apostolici muneris*).

II. - "The equality of the various social members is in this alone, namely, that all men have their origin from God the Creator; were redeemed by Jesus Christ, and are to be judged and rewarded or punished

by God, according to the exact measure of his merits and demerits". (*Quod Apostolici muneris*).

III. - "It follows from this that in human society it is in accordance with God's ordination that there should be *princes and vassals, masters and proletarians*, rich and poor, wise and ignorant, *nobles and commoners*; who, all united with one another by bonds of love, help one another to attain their ultimate end in heaven, and here on earth their material and moral well-being." (*Quod Apostolici muneris*).

XIX. - Finally, Catholic writers, in espousing the cause of the proletarians and the poor, should beware of *using language that would induce in the people an aversion to the higher classes of society*. Do not speak of reparations or justice when it is a matter of mere charity, as was said above. Remember that Jesus Christ wished to bind all men together in the bond of reciprocal love, which is the perfection of justice and brings with it the obligation to work for the mutual good.

And the *Quadragesimo anno* and the *Divini Redemptoris* of Pius XI sufficiently fix the Catholic social principles on the collaboration of the various social classes, in a sense diametrically opposed to that of the Social Revolution without need of further insistence. We Catholics have precise and determined directives for the arrangement of society, as recalled by Pius X in the *Sillon*. "Venerable Brethren, actively pursue the work of the Savior of men by imitating his meekness and his energy. Be inclined to all miseries, let no pain escape your pastoral solicitude, let no complaint find you indifferent. But also preach boldly to *great and small* alike their duties; it is up to you to form the conscience of the people and of the public authorities. . . The social question will be very close to its solution when *one and the other*, less demanding of their rights, will *fulfill their duties more exactly*."

"Moreover, as in the conflict of interests, and especially in the struggle with the forces of the wicked, neither virtue nor even holiness is always sufficient to assure man his daily bread, and as the social bearing must be so ordered that by its natural play it will paralyze the efforts of the wicked and make its share available to all men of good will

legitimate of earthly happiness, we ardently desire that to this end you take an active interest in the organization of society. For this cause, while your priests will devote themselves with zeal to the sanctification of souls, to the defense of the Church and to the works of charity properly so called, you will choose some of them active and of ponderous spirit, provided with the degrees of doctors of philosophy and *theology*, perfectly instructed in the history of ancient and modern civilization, and you will dedicate them to the less elevated and more practical studies of social science to put them, at an opportune time, at the head of the works of Catholic action. But take care that these priests do not allow themselves to be led astray in the maze of contemporary opinions by *the mirage of a false democracy; do not take from the rhetoric of the worst enemies of the Church and of the people an emphatic language full of promises as sonorous as they are unrealizable; be persuaded that the social question and social science were not born yesterday; that in all ages the Church and the State, in happy concert, have given rise to fruitful organizations for the welfare of society; that the Church, which has never betrayed the happiness of the people by compromising alliances, does not have to detach itself from the past, but it is enough for it to knot, with the help of the true workers of social restoration, the organisms broken by the revolution and to adapt them, in the same Christian spirit in which they were animated, to the new milieu created by the material evolution of contemporary society: Because the true friends of the people are neither revolutionaries nor novators, but traditionalists."*

All right, some Maritainist will say. The Holy Father is right. But the people do not listen to these doctrines of social pacification. The peoples want revenge for their offended and humiliated human dignity... the peoples want to command... they want the leading role in social life, as our Master Maritain teaches. If this is so, if one wants to condescend to the resentments nested in the popular subconscious, if one wants to erect as a directive norm of social action a "*principle... generating envy and injustice and subversive of all social order*"⁴⁴⁰, let Maritain preach the Social Revolution. . but at his own risk; do not invoke the Gospel, Christianity or the Church. Let him turn to the clandestine sects, from which Rousseau, Feuerbach, Marx, Engels, and

⁴⁴⁰ Pius X in the Letter condemning the *Sillon*.

the modern revolutionaries and from there work for the Revolution. At least then he will not provoke the deception of incautious Catholics.

Intellectual emancipation

The Letter of Pius X on the *Sillon* characterizes *intellectual emancipation* in these terms: "He (every man) is dominated, finally, by a caste called director, to which his intellectual development assures an undue preponderance in the management of business; he must therefore subtract himself from its domination". Strictly speaking, we have adduced enough testimonies from the *Sillon* and Maritain to establish this point, which is nothing other than the leading position that, in this era of humanity, belongs to the fourth estate, that is to say, to the definitively liberated proletariat. Marc Sangnier was intoxicated with enthusiasm for the irresistible rise of Democracy, which he saw as the goal of all the aspirations and all the efforts of Christian peoples. Although Lamennais has been the most original and eloquent expositor of this thesis, neither in Marc Sangnier nor in Maritain are sentimental outbursts scarce, in which Democracy appears as the term of the ascensional progress of the whole Christian tradition. "We know better than anyone - says Marc Sangnier in *Tradition et Progrès*⁴⁴¹ - that France does not date from 1789 and that this house has been built slowly and as if from stone upon stone by the secular collaboration of the people and the king. . . . And if we believe to discover that all the traditional effort of France, through feudalism, through the marvelous development of the communes, liberated, through the constant ascension, of the bourgeoisie, in the royal councils, through the more and more precise claims of the Third State, was but a slow and sure preparation of this democracy in which we dream. . . ." "It rises, this democracy, slowly, imposing itself little by little . . . it will be the demolition of the present social edifice, selfish and profane, on the ruins of which the future city will be built"⁴⁴² .

⁴⁴¹ *L'Esprit démocratique*, p. 192.

⁴⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 262.

Maritain, more profound and, therefore, more dangerous, sees the future democracy, as a fortunate term of secularized Christianity "when at the end of the 18th century the Rights of Man were proclaimed in America and in France and the peoples were invited to the ideal of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, the *great provocation of the people, of the common men, of the infantile spirit and of faith* took place and all together with an ideal of universal generosity that went beyond the political order itself calling the powerful of this world and their experienced skepticism"⁴⁴³ .

The Middle Ages," he says, "tried, with the Holy Empire, to build on earth a fortress for God. *Now, the poor and the oppressed are setting out for the city of justice and fraternity*"⁴⁴⁴ . "...democracy is linked to Christianity and the democratic impulse arose in human history as a temporal manifestation of evangelical inspiration"⁴⁴⁵ .

In the Sillonist milieu, expressions like this are collected: "Democracy is the translation in the social and political order of the "fraternal equivalence of souls", and the democratic idea "an effect of the inner work of the evangelical ferment in the human soul""⁴⁴⁶ . "Therein lies - Maritain will say - the deepest principle of the democratic ideal which is the profane name of the ideal of Christianity. That is why, writes Bergson: "democracy is of evangelical essence and has love as its principle"⁴⁴⁷ .

Brotherly love

In Marc Sangnier as well as in Maritain, the unitive bond that embodies this fraternal city, as big as the human race, will be fraternal love. Marc Sangnier attempts an explanation of the efficacy of this fraternal love as a solution to the antinomy that must necessarily be established between general and particular interests, where compulsiveness has been practically suppressed.

⁴⁴³ *Christ. et Dém.* p. 49; English ed. p. 53.

⁴⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 63; Cas. ed., p. 50; Cas. ed., p. 55.

⁴⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 43; English ed., p. 48.

⁴⁴⁶ Quoted by Ariès, *Le Sillon et le mouvement démocratique*, deux éd., Nouvelle librairie nationale, Paris, 1910, p. 274.

⁴⁴⁷ *Christ. et Dém.* p. 73; English ed. p. 80.

of the State. A democratic society, where each human individual is *self-determined* by his own conscience and responsibility, would become anarchy, to the detriment of the *common good*, which is different from that of private individuals; and since the compulsion of public power cannot be accepted, which in human societies, so far known, obliges, by virtue of the coercive force of the law, to subordinate the particular interest to the general, he invents, with the intervention of Christianity, a force, brotherly love, which identifies in the individual himself, the pursuit of self-interest with the interest of the community. "The great obstacle," he says, "to the realization of such a democracy is the conflict between *private interest* and *general interest*. The individual will see his own good in opposition to that of the State: he will be tempted to enrich himself by impoverishing the city, to take advantage of his power to the detriment of that of the nation. For democracy to be possible, these two interests must not be dissociated. The force that can not only bring them together, but also identify them, is to be found in Christianity. Christ is for us, at the same time, the broadest expression of the general interest and the narrowest expression of the particular interest: justice, truth, fraternal love are not in our eyes theoretical entities, simple abstractions of the spirit: their highest and most complete expression is God and God becoming man and communicating himself to man, that is Jesus Christ"⁴⁴⁸ .

Maritain, an extraordinarily wise *theoretical* philosopher, does not put forward this same doctrine in such openly objectionable terms. But it is implicit in his fraternal democracy, it constitutes the essence of his famous *fraternal friendship*. We have seen how he tends to suppress the *compulsion* of political authority and professional authority itself. To what elements does he resort to establish and consolidate a society where public force is *weakened*? To the famous *fraternal friendship*. Typical indeed what he says: "And the profane conscience has understood that in the temporal, social and political order, not only civic friendship is, as the ancient philosophers had recognized it, the soul and the constitutive bond of the social community - if justice is essentially demanded beforehand, it is as a necessary condition that makes friendship possible - but that this civic friendship cannot in fact prevail within the social group if *a stronger and more universal love, fraternal love, does not pass into it, and if, becoming fraternity*, it does not pass the limits of the social group to extend itself to the whole of society.

⁴⁴⁸ *L'Esprit démocratique*, p. 167.

the human race..."⁴⁴⁹ . "Once man's heart has felt the freshness of this terrible hope, it will be forever troubled. If he ceases to recognize its sources and its superhuman demands, he risks perverting himself and returning to violence in order to impose on all "fraternity or death..." "But woe betide us if we despise it and succeed in ridding the human race of the hope of fraternity. It has been exalted by it and will lose it only by becoming more savage than before. *This hope is holy in itself*; it responds to the deepest and most deeply rooted desires of human nature; it puts souls in communion of pain and impatience with all the oppressed and persecuted; it demands heroism, and has a divine power to transform human history. What is conquered by the profane conscience, if it is not diverted towards barbarism, is faith in human fraternity, the sense of social duty of compassion for man in the person of the weak and the suffering; the conviction that the political work par excellence is to make common life better and more fraternal, and to work to make, from the architecture of laws, institutions and customs of this common life, a house for brothers"⁴⁵⁰ . These phrases "*this hope is holy in itself*", "*woe betide us if we despise the hope of fraternity*", must be linked to the statement of Henry A. Wallace, reproduced on page 66: "the idea of freedom derives from the Bible and its extraordinary insistence on the dignity of the person. *Democracy is the only true political expression of Christianity*" and with what is quoted there from Bergson, "*Democracy is of evangelical essence and has love as its principle*", and with the famous *prise de conscience* which, in short, means that in the new era of the future democratic City human persons *will be self-determined* to their own true good, without the need for savior classes. The common people, common humanity, will instinctively know how to choose the good that suits them⁴⁵¹ . This is the heroic humanism⁴⁵² that will have been realized by *le passage de quelque chose de divin*⁴⁵³ the house of brothers that will become the earth by the action of the preclari cives.

⁴⁴⁹ *Christ. et Dém.* pp. 63-64; English ed. p. 69.

⁴⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁴⁵¹ Ibid., p. 88; English ed., p. 96.

⁴⁵² Ibid. pp. 99-108; English ed. pp. 109 ff.

⁴⁵³ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 208.

This heroic humanism of Maritain, this fraternal future City of Marc Sangnier that will have freed human persons from all *hétérogénique* domination, by the force of fraternal friendship, will also have taken from them, in a certain way, the national homelands themselves to give them conscience of humanity. "The necessary power - says Marc Sangnier -, this power that we do not want to destroy, we understand to distribute it, what shall I say, to multiply it so much that each citizen will feel responsible, not only for his *personal interests*, not only for his interests *of his profession*, but also for the interests *of the homeland*, even more *for the whole humanity*"⁴⁵⁴.

"Democracy, of which no one can be so blind as to deny its irresistible rise, must understand and realize the fatherland. Let us be content to shine a light on what is weak and unsustainable in the situation of these nationalists who think of immobilizing the fatherland in one of the ways that - I agree - it has gone through and is still going through today, but which could not limit its evolution, let us say better, its slow and sure ascent"⁴⁵⁵.

Maritain for his part speaks that "the spirit of national vindication and national pride will give way to the spirit of supernational community"⁴⁵⁶ and in a very suggestive note of his *Du Régime temporel*⁴⁵⁷ he says about *the fatherland* things in agreement with those of Marc Sangnier under whose equivocal language, apparently orthodox, hides a vulgar *internationalism*: "For each one to love his fatherland it is not necessary that he *idealizes* it according to his personal dogmatics.... the homeland... is a real, concrete, existing good that responds to a particular vocation in *the great movement of the "human caravan..."*..." An analysis not vitiated by nominalism would show that beneath the multiple Frances which diversify in the consciousness of the French of such and such a party there is, not emptiness, or a simple hope, but a humble and precious human reality present and alive and of which every Frenchman, whatever he does, is a member...". The same applies, consequently, to the France which sees its health in the hammer and sickle, or in American humanitarianism, or in English politics... or in the traditions of the French people.

⁴⁵⁴ *Discours*, t. I, p. 305.

⁴⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵⁶ *Christ. et Dém.* p. 21; English ed. p. 19.

⁴⁵⁷ *Du régime temporel et de la liberté*, p. 126 in note.

French. In *Humanisme Intégral*⁴⁵⁸ he cannot disguise his cosmopolitanism. "The problem," he says, "which is posed to them (the *preclari cives*) and which is insoluble for any policy *à objectif rapproché* is to lead - by means of the profound changes and the required structural adjustments, and also of *the diminutions of sovereignty necessary* for the establishment of a true international temporal community - the existing political cities, through the vicissitudes and the dissolution of the present regime, *to a new regime of civilization, profoundly different from the present regime because it must really refract in the social-terrestrial sphere the evangelical demands*". Thus, the driving ideal of their actions to be proposed by the Maritainian *preclari cives* is a cosmopolitan international regime, in which national frontiers must disappear.

In Maritainian thought, evangelical love - his famous fraternal friendship - will penetrate the substance of his universal city, breaking bonds of servitude, tutelage and paternalism, suppressing social classes and national frontiers, and will unite in a fraternal, universal love the whole human race. After this there remains for man only "the "new heavens" of the resurrection", Maritain will say, as an echo of Lamennais who in an analogous rapture said: "*Ce qu' on peut désirer de plus n' est pas de la terre*"⁴⁵⁹ .

Maritain's thought is recorded, with surprising fidelity, in the words of Pius X when he summarizes the intellectual emancipation of the *Sillon*:

"Here is now the capital element, the moral element. As authority, as we have seen, is very reduced, another force is necessary to replace it and to oppose a permanent reaction to individual selfishness. This new principle, this force, is *the love of the professional interest and of the public interest, that is to say, of the very end of the profession and of society*. Imagine a society where in the soul of each member, with the innate love of the individual and family good, the love of the professional and public good reigns; where in the conscience of each citizen these loves are subordinated in such a way that the higher good always comes before the lower good, this society could not pass almost without authority and would not offer the ideal of human dignity, having each citizen a soul

⁴⁵⁸ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 263.

⁴⁵⁹ *L'Avenir de la société*, 28/VI/1831. II, 466.

of a king, each worker a master's soul? Torn from the narrowness of his private interests and elevated to those of his profession, and higher still, to those of the whole nation, and higher still, *to those of humanity* (for the horizon of the *Sillon* does not stop at the borders of the Fatherland, but extends to all men to the ends of the world), the human heart, *enlarged by the love of the common good*, would embrace all companions of the same profession, all compatriots, *all men*. And here is the greatness and the ideal human nobility realized by the famous trilogy: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity".

And what the Pope adds, also characterizes Maritain's famous new Christianity, or his Integral Humanism, or the Humanism of the Incarnation, heroic Humanism, personalist democracy, fraternal City, City of justice and fraternity, the House for brothers, the new epoch of civilization, the vitally Christian society, the temporal social refraction of the Gospel, the earthly emancipation of humanity, in short, the culmination of "the natural aspiration of the human person to liberation from misery, from servitude, from the exploitation of man by man". After this, "the advent of the kingdom of God and of the land of the resurrected".

Now," says the Pope, "these three elements, political, economic and moral, are subordinate one to the other, the principal one being, as we have said, the moral element. Indeed, it is impossible for any political democracy to live if it lacks deep roots in economic democracy; but at the same time, neither the one nor the other is possible if it is not rooted in such a state of mind that the conscience possesses proportionate responsibilities and moral forces. But *suppose a state of mind thus formed of conscious responsibility and moral forces*, and economic democracy will arise from there, naturally, to explain itself in acts of that conscious responsibility and those forces; in the same way and by the same path political democracy will emerge from the corporative regime; and political democracy and economic democracy, the latter as support of the former, will remain rooted in the consciousness of the people even on unshakable foundations.

"Such is, in short, the theory, one might say the dream, of the *Sillon*; to that tends his teaching and what he calls democratic education of the people, *n a m e l y , to raise to the highest degree the civic conscience and responsibility of each citizen, from which will flow economic democracy, and politics, and the reign of justice, liberty, equality and fraternity.*"

What to think of this messianic dream? In the first place, it involves the perversion of the concept of fraternity. Pius X says: "The same is true of the notion of fraternity, whose foundation is laid in the love of common interests or, above all philosophies and all religions, *in the simple notion of humanity, thus encompassing in the same love and tolerance all men* with all their miseries, intellectual and moral as well as physical and temporal. But Catholic doctrine teaches us that the first duty of charity is not in *toleration of erroneous convictions*, however sincere they may be, nor in *theoretical or practical indifference* to error or vice in which we see our brethren plunged, but in *zeal for their intellectual and moral improvement, no less than for their material welfare*. This same Catholic doctrine also teaches us that the origin of love of neighbor is to be found in the love of God, the common Father and common end of the whole human family, and in the love of Jesus Christ, of whom we are to such an exalted degree members, that to console an unfortunate person is to do good to Jesus Christ himself. All other love is an illusion or a sterile and passing affection. Human experience in pagan or lay societies of all times proves it well, proving that at certain times the consideration of common interests or similarity of nature weighs very little in conflict with the passions and appetites of the heart. No, Venerable Brethren, there is no true fraternity outside of Christian charity, which for the love of God and of his Son Jesus Christ, our Savior, embraces all men to console them and bring them all to the same faith and to the same beatitude of heaven. By separating fraternity from Christian charity thus understood, democracy, far from being progress, *would constitute a disastrous step backward for civilization*. For to arrive, as we desire with all our souls to arrive, at the greatest possible sum of well-being for society and for each of its members through fraternity, or as it is also said, through universal solidarity, *it is necessary to have the union of minds in truth, the union of wills in morality, the union of hearts in the love of God and of his Son Jesus Christ*.

But como such a union no be realizable except by Catholic charity, it follows that this alone can lead peoples along the path of progress to the ideal of civilization."

Charity, a supernatural virtue that can only be perfected by the consolidation of all the other supernatural and natural virtues, does not destroy the natural and *historical* differences of human society; on the contrary, by purifying them of all injustice, it consolidates them, strengthens them and, above them, and like a descent from the heart of God, unites and binds together the parts of the universal order. It is the very opposite of a humanitarian cosmopolitanism. It unites by a consolidation of human individuals integrated in the family, in the profession, in the neighborhood; and these in a social, provincial or regional community; and these in sovereign political States; and these then in the international community, which does not *diminish*, does not sacrifice, the inferior, but on the contrary, consolidates and affirms it, by integrating it into the international society. And in this operation of integration-not disintegration-at every stage of it, the Church must be present to affirm right relationships-both natural and historical-and thus form not a uniform universal mass, composed of atomized human persons, but Christendom, the united human family, in whose unity "individuals do not appear to us detached from one another like grains of sand, but, on the contrary, united in organic, harmonious and mutual relationships, diverse as the times vary, by natural impulse and internal destiny.

And peoples," says Pius XII, "in their development and in their differences according to the conditions of life and culture, are not destined to break the unity of the human race, but to enrich and embellish it by the communication of their particular gifts and by the reciprocal exchange of goods, which can be both possible and effective only when mutual love and a lively charity unite all the children of the same Father and all those redeemed by the same divine blood" (*Summi Pontificatus*).

Having verified the common characteristics of the Sillonist city and the Maritainian city, and having verified the accuracy of the very wise words of Pius X that so punctually censure the one and the other, let us continue the parallel of the two cities.

both cities at several very important coincidences concerning practical activity.

The builders of the new Christianity

Lay builders

In order to establish who are to be the builders of the Maritainian fraternal city, we must first determine the sphere in which it is to develop; and since it is nothing other than human civilization, under the sign of Christ, it would seem to fall under two jurisdictions or domains, the civil and the ecclesiastical, the State and the Church, united in an internal subordination, like the body to the soul, according to the respective subordination that inescapably exists between the ends of the one and the other. For Christian civilization, although the work of the laity, is also first and foremost the work of the Church. Thus Pius XI reminds us

XI when it says: "The Church exercises her ministry of the word through priests... whom she sends everywhere as tireless heralds of the good news, which *alone can preserve or establish or revive true civilization*"⁴⁶⁰.

Enclosing in its bosom the Christian civilization temporal and spiritual values, it falls under the jurisdiction of the Church, *direct* in the spiritual, *indirect* in the temporal and falls in the temporal under the direct jurisdiction of the State. The Christian city is the work of the State and the Church in happy concert. An invariable secular doctrine like the Church itself, brilliantly enunciated in the Bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII and in the *Immortale Dei* of Leo XIII. Maritain professed this doctrine which he ardently defended against the *Action Française*. But after he, like Lamennais, discovered that it was good for the days of the infancy of Christian peoples and that today it no longer suits them because they have reached mature age, he asserts another teaching. "The medieval Church," he says, "has directly formed and shaped political Europe because it was then necessary to bring forth from chaos the temporal order itself; a task of addition (*surcroit*) to which it could not refuse, but to which it had not at first resigned itself without legitimate apprehension. Today the

⁴⁶⁰ *Ad catholici sacerdotii.*

temporal organism exists and is highly differentiated". What is highly differentiated? A human society or a materialistic society? And has not the temporal, let us say the earthly and material conception of life, reached a high "differentiation", a high "consciousness" of its own worth, of its sufficiency, of its autonomy, of its *end in itself*, of its absoluteness as God, precisely because it has become independent and because it has removed from itself its subordination to the authentic spiritual values incarnated only in the Church? And in this deification of the temporal no lies precisely the capital sin and the cancer that corrodes the once Christian society and leads it to its ruin? How then does Maritain intend to found a *right* and seek the *remedy* precisely where injustice is rooted and where the decay lies?

So that this temporal organism which has become de-Christianized and corrupted because it has separated itself from the Church is now going to be saved, without the Church, by Christians; as if Christians (and what Christians, as we shall see later, who are nothing but Maritainists together with materialists, Buddhists, agnostics, etc.), insofar as they are in communication with the Church, should not be rejected by this temporal organism, which has come of age, just as the Church itself is rejected, and should not be consented to except insofar as they are socially rejected by the Church itself.) insofar as they are in communication with the Church would not have to be rejected by that temporal organism, of age, as the Church itself is rejected, and would not have to be *consented to* except insofar as *socially* they distance themselves from the Church. But let us leave these considerations aside and let us note that Maritain insists on conceiving Christian civilization as a "temporal organism" when, in reality, just as man is "temporal-supernatural" because it contains values of two qualities that fall directly under two respective jurisdictions, those of the State and those of the Church. From here are born the other disastrous deviations. "In other words," he says, "the clergy must not wield the levers of command of properly temporal and political action...". It is clear that if the Christian city is to be the *common work* of the priest and the laity, *in happy concert*, the priest must not exercise civil functions just as the laity must not presume to interfere in ecclesiastical ones. Each, in their respective functions, not as if they were two separate worlds, but as if they were *building one and the same city*, in the edification of which the priesthood, the minister of the spiritual, has a first and principal function. But if this city is previously made "a temporal organism", it is evident that the priesthood of the Church has no

mission in it and can only intervene *very indirectly in* the care of the souls of those who build it if they are Catholics. This is how Maritain conceives things, but in order to do so, he has had to *denaturalize* the concept and

the reality of a *Christian city*, and for this he must draw up the plans of a lay, neutral, indifferent and atheistic city, because what else is a city where the Church, the living incarnation of the supernatural, does not enter directly and como such a city? Hence it is that the words of Pius X so exactly fit your city: "No, Venerable Brethren, it is necessary to remember it in these times of social and intellectual anarchy in which all sit as doctors and legislators; *the city will not be built differently from the way God built it; society will not be built if the Church does not lay the foundations and direct the work*; civilization is not to be invented nor the new city to be built in the clouds. It has existed and exists; it is *Christian civilization, it is the Catholic city*". While Pius X says categorically that *society will not be built if the Church does not lay the foundations and direct the work*, Maritain with Lamennais and the Catholic liberals teaches that in no way, that this was fine in the Middle Ages, a *sacred*, naive and childish time⁴⁶¹ but that in the new age, whose dawn is dawning, it is the laity who must assume this task.

The maritainist preclari cives

Which lay people? It is the Maritainists, "the preclari cives", those who will work out a "politics which as politics is Christianly inspired and ordered to a temporal Christian ideal" .⁴⁶² those who will work on a "policy which, as a policy, is *Christianly inspired* and ordered to a Christian temporal ideal"⁴⁶³ .

Marc Sangnier professed the same and identical error. "The purpose of the *Sillon* is to realize in France the *democratic Republic*. It is not, to speak properly and directly, a *Catholic work* in the sense that it is not a work whose particular object is to place itself at the disposal of the bishops and priests to help them in their proper ministry... the *Sillon* is a *lay movement*, which does not prevent it from being a profoundly religious movement, because the Sillonists highly recognize that they have need of Catholicism not only to fulfill individually personal salvation, but also to have the moral forces and virtues that the temporal work they have set themselves demands"⁴⁶⁴ . And what Maritain calls *preclari cives*, or *elites*⁴⁶⁵ , Marc Sangnier called *elite* or *les meneurs*⁴⁶⁶ . The *elite*," says Marc Sangnier, "which calls for democratic work.

⁴⁶¹ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 150 ff.

⁴⁶² Ibid., p. 260.

⁴⁶³ Ibid., p. 267.

⁴⁶⁴ Lettre de Marc Sangnier, *La Croix*, 19-20/VIII/1906.

⁴⁶⁵ *Christ. et Dém.* p. 85; English ed. p. 93.

⁴⁶⁶ *La lutte de la démocratie*, p. 53.

will certainly not be able to start by being a numerical majority, some say that it will never be anything but a minority. It is enough, in truth, that it be a *dynamic majority*. The social forces that guide the particular interests of individuals or groups are contradictory and tend sensibly to neutralize each other; there is a law analogous to the mechanical law of action and reaction. It is enough that one of these forces, escaping the determinism of particular interests, is oriented towards the general interest so that immediately the sum of these liberated forces constitutes the dynamic majority and drags the whole nation in its direction"⁴⁶⁷. Maritain writes something similar⁴⁶⁸ : "A grouping of this kind, which can only be conceived on the basis of the institutional freedoms of the country, and of the respect of the existing political regime, is capable of exercising, if the mass of its adherents is sufficiently large and sufficiently organized, a decisive action on the destinies of the country". We do not intend to diminish the depth with which the Maritainian thought is presented, whose truly profound character, at least, by uncovering the problems contained in the philosophy of culture today, stands out more, next to the superficialities of social orator with which Marc Sangnier's thought is dressed; but whatever these differences may be, what is certain is that they say the same thing.

The *preclari cives* of Maritain, "conscious of the temporal task of Christianity and concerned to act in the temporal domain"⁴⁶⁹, will have to carry out a political action *a objectif rapproché* and a political action *a objectif éloigné*⁴⁷⁰, "political action *a objectif rapproché*, a political action which, even if it wishes to work for a very vast future, determines itself as an action and measures its impulse in relation to a next realization which serves as its point of aim"⁴⁷¹. "In the presence of the great difficulties - says Maritain⁴⁷² - that I have just enumerated, it could happen that our *cives preclari* are tempted to withdraw into an activity that is also temporary, but superior to the diversity of political parties... I mean, on the strictly limited terrain of the temporary defense of religious interests and religious liberties, whatever it may be.

⁴⁶⁷ *L'sprit*, p. 176.

⁴⁶⁸ *Lettre sur l'indépendance*, p. 38.

⁴⁶⁹ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 260.

⁴⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 262.

whatever is left over. Such an activity is certainly indispensable, it is necessary, but it is insufficient. It is imperatively required of the Christian, but he must not *withdraw* into it. It must not be absent from any domain of human activity, it is required everywhere. But they must work in a political action *a objectif éloigné* or *a longue portée*... in the realization of a temporal Christian historical ideal..."⁴⁷³ . The problems on which they are to be employed "concern a much narrower question, and which is essentially situated in the field of *politics* and political philosophy; they concern the question of a *political activity* which, as politics, is *Christianly inspired* and ordered to a temporal Christian ideal; in other words, the question of what must be, in the conditions of the modern age, a just political activity in the eyes of the Christian philosopher of culture and society; and the answer proposed does not claim to be the only possible one.... is integral humanism"⁴⁷⁴ .

But let Maritain conceive things as he wishes, give the builders of his Christianity the name that pleases him most, "*political fraternity - preclari cives - elites - petit nombre*", adorn them with exalted qualities, even of *holiness*, with *vocation of leadership*⁴⁷⁵ ; let him explain on what plane of activity of life they are to act; let him distinguish, as some naive person clarifies it at length between "*politicien*" and "*politique*"....The fact is that if this *privileged group* succeeds, it will have made *the Christian form* prevail in the fraternal democratic city "because the bearers of this Christian conception will have had enough spiritual energy, strength, and political prudence to show practically to men capable of understanding that such a conception is in conformity with sound reason and the common good; and also - because the men capable of understanding are the small number - to arouse and deserve the confidence of others, to lead them with the authority of true leaders and to exercise authority in a city that must be imagined to be provided with an organically constituted political structure"⁴⁷⁶ . This -no more and no less- was Marc Sangnier's intention, although he expressed it in more realistic and more frank language. "Democracy demands an *elite* whose moral authority will impose itself by an invincible ascendancy. There is in fact no social organization that requires the

⁴⁷³ Ibid.

⁴⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 267.

⁴⁷⁵ Ibid. pp. 260ff; *Du régime temporel*, pp. 172ff.

⁴⁷⁶ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 180.

authority more imperiously than democracy. Only this one does not impose itself brutally from the outside on bent slaves. It reaches the heart, folds the wills, demands a free, consented obedience".

The reader will find an exact description of the spirit that animates Maritain's *preclari cives* in these words of Pope Pío X: "The doctrines of the *Sillon* do not remain in the domain of philosophical abstraction, but are taught to young Catholics, and moreover, they are tried out in practice. Considering *the Sillon as the nucleus of the future city*, it reflects it as faithfully as possible, banishing all hierarchy from its bosom. The chosen body that directs it has separated itself from the vulgar by *selection*, that is to say, by *imposing itself by its moral authority and its virtues*. The entrance and the exit are free. The studies are done without a teacher, or at most with some counselor. The study circles are true intellectual cooperatives, where each one is in a whole master and disciple. The most unlimited companionship reigns among the members and puts their souls in total contact; hence the common soul of the *Sillon*. It has been defined "*a friendship*". The priest himself, when he enters it, abases the eminent dignity of his priesthood, and by the strangest exchange of roles, becomes a pupil, puts himself on the level of his young friends, and is no longer more than a comrade".

Just as the Maritainian Christian city, like the Sillonist democracy, brings together on a *common basis*, a *common soul*, believers and non-believers, and even atheists, materialists, communists, as long as they embrace the same *Christian ideal*, a *Christian ideal*, let the reader not forget, detached from the Church, which can take *heretical forms and even revolts*, such as the Puritan-Calvinist ideal of life in England and the United States, the "revolutionary" ideal of secularist France and Communist Russia⁴⁷⁷ ; so also the *preclari cives*, the "saints" of the "political fraternity", of the "new style of sanctity", of the "new style of sanctity".⁴⁷⁸ of the "new style of holiness"⁴⁷⁹ also include "non-Christians who recognize in a more or less complete way the well-foundedness of this philosophy"⁴⁸⁰ . As we have referred above to the "mingling" of young Catholics with heretics and unbelievers of all kinds (Pius X in the *Sillon*) that the Maritainian city implies

⁴⁷⁷ *Christ. et Dém.* pp. 43-44; English ed. p. 49.

⁴⁷⁸ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 254.

⁴⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 128.

⁴⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 267.

It is not necessary to insist here; suffice it to say that the *Sillon*'s behavior was no different.

In February 1907 Sangnier, at the Congress of the *Sillon*, in Orleans, announced the intention to operate a "*déclassements des partis*", in other words, to found under the name of the "greatest *sillon*" a movement where Catholics, Protestants and even atheists, would be grouped on the basis of a "center of moral unity", gathering "all the forces animated consciously or unconsciously of the Christian spirit"⁴⁸¹ "....who, whether they participate in our positive faith or not, are truly animated by our *Christian ideal*, and are capable of bringing to Democracy a real sense of justice and fraternity"⁴⁸² , and in the official Bulletin of the movement it could be read: "Victor Hugo, Combeferre, Courbeyrac, no matter how much freethinkers they call themselves, are truly *Christians*.... All those, whoever they may be, who admit this ideal of beauty, justice and goodness, *even if they were unjust and hated by Catholicism, all these are with us*"⁴⁸³ . "Those who want to dedicate a marble to Zola should know that their place is marked at the crossroads from where the road leads to the ideal truth." A little later, in 1905, in *Univers*, Marc Sangnier would be moved, with regard to Gorky, by "these anarchists of mystical and profound soul, of murky and sweet dreams that Holy Russia *piously* encloses in its vast bosom as disturbing germs of *revolt* and *strange redemption*. On the other hand, Gorky, Tolstoy, like all those over there, have religious souls? Let us discover to them the true Christianity..... At once they will lie down on the *eperdûment* as in the painful end of their restless quests. . ."⁴⁸⁴ .

In November 1905, a rally in favor of the Russian revolutionaries took place in Paris. Marc Sangnier was among the speakers, along with M. M. Havet, Anatole France, Clemenceau, Buisson, Seignobos.... The *Temps* reports: "The word was then given to Marc Sangnier. The young director of the *Sillon*, listened with relative benevolence, at least at the beginning of his speech, by the militant anticlericals, brings the protest.

⁴⁸¹ *Le Sillon*, 10/II/ 1907.

⁴⁸² L' éveil démocratique, 10 / III / 1907 .

⁴⁸³ *Le Sillon*, 21 / X / 1901 .

⁴⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 10/X/1902.

of Catholics against the oppression of Russian subjects. He attacks the French government for having concluded an alliance with the Muscovite government and salutes, as a Christian, the coming victory of the cause of justice and freedom over resistance and autocracy"⁴⁸⁵ . The Sillonist democracy which will bring together all, believers and non-believers, as long as they accept "the Christian ideal" of liberty, equality and fraternity, will be stimulated, activated and created by this *elite*, this dynamic majority, which, with the *esprit du Sillon*⁴⁸⁶ *l'âme commune*, the "love stronger than hatred" ⁴⁸⁷ the "*life of the Sillon, the friendship of the Sillon....*"⁴⁸⁸ which consists of an egalitarian and fraternal tuteo which is rigorous in the sect, as much in the feminine groups as in the masculine circles. A leftist and sentimental fraternity.

The reader has here the explanation of the fraternal friendship that now the Maritainists, as then the Sillonists, experience for the leftists of all stripes; as cordial, deep and tender "as the rage that drags them against those Catholics who have not understood the repercussion of the Christian ideal in the political and social domain"⁴⁸⁹ . Marc Sangnier lashes out at these in an article entitled "The inner enemies of Catholicism" because "they do not want to yield a stone of their fortresses so dismantled and if they enclose in the depths of their heroic souls the faith of their grandparents, it is, no doubt, in the company of old idols of a sterile and harmful selfishness"⁴⁹⁰ . These idols are the traditional and conservative uses and bonds of society against which the Maritainian and Sillonist leftism directs its fury in order to hasten the destruction of the present civilization and to carve out the *new one*, that of "*the reintegration of Israel*"⁴⁹¹ . It is to these Catholics that Maritain refers when he speaks of the *shortcomings* of Christians, and when he laments that many Christians (meaning Catholics in communion with the Catholic Church) have lost "this idea of the historical vocation of humanity" (i.e. the path of Universal Democracy); Christians who "while remaining attached to the dogmas of the faith, leave aside the

⁴⁸⁵ Barbier, *Les erreurs du Sillon*, pp. 186-193.

⁴⁸⁶ Ariès N., *Le Sillon et le mouvement démocratique*, Paris, 1910, p. 174.

⁴⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 227.

⁴⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 253 .

⁴⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 254.

⁴⁹⁰ *L'Esprit démocratique*, p. 212.

⁴⁹¹ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 248.

inspiration of faith, when it is a matter of judging human things⁴⁹², i.e. when they resist to accept the social-temporal refraction of the Gospel, interpreted by Maritain and applied to the profane substance of life; when they resist to accept the Revolution of Christian inspiration.

In the Maritainist environment these Catholics are repugnant "totalitarians", "Nazi-fascists", "clericalists", "pagans", "slavers", against whom the Master, has pronounced sentence of excommunication from his fraternal city, when he writes: "We do not wish him to be burned or expelled from the city, or locked up in a concentration camp. But the democratic community should defend itself against him, whether he be materialist, idealist, agnostic, Christian or Jew, Muslim or Buddhist, by keeping him away from the leadership, through the power of a strong and well-informed public opinion, and should even hand him over to justice when his activity endangers the security of the state"⁴⁹³. The words used by Pius X to qualify the sillonist's Catholicism turn out to be excessively mild, to characterize that of the Maritainists. So fussy," says the Pope, "that whoever does *not embrace his cause* is in his eyes an *inner enemy of Catholicism* and *does not understand a word of the Gospel or of Jesus Christ*".

We must emphasize here the methodical work carried out by the Maritainists, apparently in compliance with directives supplied by the Master, to infiltrate Catholic organizations, undoubtedly as a preparation, *à objectif éloigné* of the future "House of Brothers". The fact is that one notices in them a special predilection to seize managerial positions, levers of command "les leviers du commande"⁴⁹⁴ of the organizations of Catholic Action, especially of the youth branches, and in a particular way, of the *Young Catholic Workers*, founded by Canon Cardijn. Maritain is pleased to cite with special *flavor* this organization as if it were a work to which he fully gives his "*placet*" and the Maritainists strive, even here among us, happily without success, to appropriate it; it is also remarkable the methodical and constant work that, overcoming great difficulties, they develop among the young people of the Catholic Worker's Youth.

⁴⁹² *Les Droits*, p. 49; English ed., p. 58.

⁴⁹³ *El Pueblo*, 13/V/1945.

⁴⁹⁴ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 273.

the priests of both clergy, seeking to conquer for their orbit those who are conquerable and creating an "abhorrent" atmosphere for those who are impervious to the Maritainian refractions; admirable also the persistent visits "in chain" that they make to the high ecclesiastical authorities, in the eagerness to provoke declarations or dispositions that then they, by means of the great liberal or communist newspapers where they are handled - perhaps without them knowing it - of fifth columnists in the Catholic field - will be in charge of making them appear as favorable to their cause. In our country, what we know is also noticeable in our neighbors, how a favorite disciple receives the directives of the Master, which are then communicated to the nucleus of the most faithful and confident, reach penetration in a large number of religious, cultural, economic and political institutions and are disseminated in powerful organs and in propaganda publications subsidized by embassies of foreign countries; the national and foreign clergymen who revolve in the orbit of their ideology are skillfully used as carriers of the temporal hope that men place in the new "Christianity". This explains how a numerically insignificant group, but with a "dynamic majority", in Marc Sangnier's expression, succeeds, by mobilizing the liberal and communist tendencies underlying the Catholic milieus, in constituting a powerful movement which, when reflected in the major newspapers, appears as Catholic opinion.

The slogan of confusion will inevitably rest on a *practical identification* of *Christianity and democracy*. It is evident that a Catholic can be a democrat, preferring a regime of political life that, without sacrificing the common good of the city, accommodates itself to a way of civic coexistence that preferentially takes into account the freedom and equality of citizens. But even in these cases such a Catholic will not be a democrat because he is a Catholic, nor because the Gospel demands it, nor because of any Christian inspiration; he will be a democrat for legitimate reasons, no doubt, but purely temporal. The Maritainists want to *confuse* everything. They want to be democrats because they are Catholics, because the Gospel demands it, and if we were to delve into the psychic dynamics of their democratic "experiences" we would discover that they want to be Catholics or Christians in order to be democrats. Democracy" and modern democracy, the

of the Revolution, is the God they worship. "*It is a religion*⁴⁹⁵ *more universal than the Catholic Church.*"

This spirit of Maritainism was flagrantly revealed in Pius XII's Christmas 1944 allocution on "democracy. A reflective reading of this allocution makes it clear that it does nothing more than update the traditional teaching of the Church. If the peoples want "democracy" and "better democracy", the Pope says in substance, the Church is not opposed to it "*provided that it adapts itself to procure the good of the citizens*"; consequently, it is necessary to examine "*according to what norm it should be regulated so that it can be called a true and healthy democracy, adapted to the circumstances of the present time*". But it is enough that the Holy Father has used the word *democracy* and renewed the legitimacy that the Church has always accorded him in the abstract, for the Maritainists, serving as an outpost for the most rabid anticlerical leftists, to present the Pope as opening a new historical epoch in which it will not be possible to be Catholic without a profession of democratic faith, and what is worse, of modern democracy coming out of the Revolution, as an efflorescence of the Gospel.

This identification of democracy and Christianity that nestles in the bowels of Maritainism and that is born of elevating to the category of religion or *general philosophy of life* (Maritain will say), what can only be an accidental accessory form in a legitimate conception of life, explains the perpetual equivocation and confusion of Maritainism as that of sillonism. Presenting itself as religious and democratic at the same time, it spreads confusion in the Catholic camp. Because if in order to be Catholic one must be a democrat, those who are not democrats are *ipso facto* accused of being bad Catholics and democratic politics is made a domain that falls under the direct jurisdiction of the Church because

How can being a stranger to the ecclesiastical jurisdictional domain be a condition for being Catholic? Both the Maritainist and the Sillonist play their game by maintaining this *duplicity*: because if they are accused of being a mere political party, they invoke I don't know what evangelical demands; if they are forced to submit *directly* to the Church as every Catholic organization, they reply that their terrain is temporal and autonomous like that of politics.

⁴⁹⁵ Pius X, *Condemnatory Letter of the Sillon*.

"Born of the conception - wrote an author in 1910 regarding the *Sillon* - that identifies *democracy and Christianity*, it will never eliminate this constitutive element from its being because it owes its life to it, this famous "life of the *Sillon*", which is something very real and to renounce it would be at the same time to renounce its existence"⁴⁹⁶ . "The *Sillon*," says the same author, "retains, in spite of everything, its religious character "in order to be able to penetrate Catholic organizations and milieus. "Calling itself secular and political, it wanted to ensure its autonomy"⁴⁹⁷ . "It is to be noted that the public action of the *Sillon*, which is believed to be incoherent, always ends in the same result: on the one hand to give credence to the forces of the anti-social and anti-Catholic Revolution, on the other, to disintegrate that of the Catholics. This invariable result is obtained by a duplicity of attitude that will never be sufficiently condemned. The *Sillon* has vociferously manifested its sympathy for the Russian anarchists, martyrs of the "autocracy". But he would have feared to lack evangelical gentleness by organizing a rally against the murderers of Hippolyte Debroise, a young Catholic killed in Aubervilliers by anti-clerical hotheads who, revolver in hand, assaulted the oratory of which he was a member"⁴⁹⁸ .

Hence the words of Pius X addressed to the *Sillon* also apply against the Maritainists, who with duplicity of attitudes if not of intentions work, invoking "Christian inspiration" to impose in the world a democracy where Catholics, Protestants, atheists, communists, agnostics, materialists can all fit; and yet they pretend to move in the field of the temporal where ecclesiastical authority does not directly reach. Pius X says: "It is convenient to censure severely the pretension of the *Sillon* of subtracting itself from the direction of the ecclesiastical authority. The leaders of the *Sillon* allege that they move on a terrain that is not that of the Church; that they only propose *ends of the temporal order*, and not of the spiritual order; that the Sillonist is simply a Catholic dedicated to the cause of the working classes, to democratic works and that he draws from the practices of his faith the courage of his sacrifice; that, no more or less than Catholic artisans, farmers, economists and politicians, they are subject to the rules of morals, common to all, without

⁴⁹⁶ Ariès N., *Le Sillon et le mouvement démocratique*, p. 169.

⁴⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 170.

⁴⁹⁸ *Ibid.* p. 177.

depend, no more and no less than they do, in a special way on ecclesiastical authority.

"The answer to these subterfuges is very easy. Who would be led to believe that the Catholic armchair workers, that the priests and seminarians enlisted in their ranks have, in their social activity, no other aim than the temporal interests of the working classes? To affirm such a thing of them, we believe, would be to offend them. The truth is that the leaders of the *Sillon* proclaim themselves irreducible idealists; that they want to raise the working classes by first raising the human conscience; that they have *their own social doctrine and their own philosophical and religious principles for reorganizing society on a new plan*; that they have formed *a special concept of human dignity, liberty, justice and fraternity*, and that, to justify their social dreams, they *appeal to the Gospel interpreted in their own way*, and what is even more serious, to *a disfigured and diminished Christ*. Moreover, they teach these ideas in their study circles, inculcate them in their companions and transfer them to their works. They are, therefore, true teachers of social, civic and religious morals; and whatever modifications they may introduce in the organization of the Sillonist movement, we have the right to say that the purpose of the *Sillon*, its character, its action belong to the domain of morals, which is the proper domain of the Church, and that, consequently, the Sillonists are deluded when they believe they are working in a field in whose boundaries the rights of doctrinal and directive power of ecclesiastical authority expire."

Ecclesiastical approvals

In order to justify their actions, the Maritainists exhibit a great number of approvals and encouragements received from the Holy Father in favor of their Master and from bishops from all parts of the world in favor of the cause they defend. It is therefore interesting to recall the fame that the *Sillon* had achieved in the Catholic camp.

By 1905, this had reached its peak. Affiliated study circles functioned everywhere, in most religious colleges and in many seminaries, major and minor, almost always openly with the approval if not the formal desire of superiors and bishops. It existed also in the patronages. The young men, devoured by zeal, would rush into

They were convinced that Marc Sangnier would work more effectively with them than with anyone else in the spread of Catholicism. His young leader, everywhere acclaimed, enjoyed a growing reputation among his co-religionists: one day he was even asked to speak in a convent of cloistered nuns. Another time, a bishop who had come to listen to him in a conference held in his major seminary, exclaimed in front of the moved seminarians: "You will judge us all, sir", no doubt wanting to express his admiration for the merits superior to his own. These words and stories circulated and produced their effect. In certain parishes, the *Sillon's* almanacs and pamphlets were given to children as catechism prizes. Finally, the *Sillon*, posing as an irresistible movement of Catholic conquest, enjoyed unparalleled stimuli and unheard of favors⁴⁹⁹ .

The *Sillon* receives tokens of benevolence from the French episcopate: in Paris, Lyon, Perigueux, Mans, Limoges, Nice, Oran. Marc Sangnier is triumphantly received by the clergy, and bishops are still seen associating themselves with his work, presiding at congresses, saying opening masses, giving speeches and making recommendations to their seminarians in favor of the *Sillon*. Cardinal Rampolla, in the name of the Holy Father, wrote to Marc Sangnier on December 7, 1902; Pius X received Marc Sangnier accompanied by some Sillonists in 1903; Cardinal Merry del Val wrote to Msgr. Delamaire on the eve of the Périgueux congress: "His Holiness has been pleased to stimulate the *wise initiative of the Sillon*, in the hope of always seeing its good results in the service of religion for the awakening of faith and Catholic sentiments"; in September of the same year the Sillonists in number of 600 are received by the Pope; and as late as January 1905, on the eve of the 1906 National Congress of the *Sillon*, Cardinal Merry del Val, Secretary of State, wrote to Cardinal Richard, Archbishop of Paris: "For this reason His Holiness praises Your Eminence for the favor accorded to the young people of the *Sillon*...."⁵⁰⁰ .

These encouragements and hopes of the Pope in favor of this youthful movement explain the words, filled with sorrow, with which the Holy Father was later to express himself in the condemnation of August 23, 1910: "And now, penetrated

⁴⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 149.

⁵⁰⁰ L. Barbier, *op. cit.*, vol. IV, pp. 25 ff.

With the most lively sadness, we ask you, Venerable Brethren, what has become of the Catholicism of the *Sillon*. Alas! The one that once gave such beautiful hopes, that crystalline and impetuous river has been stopped in its course by the modern enemies of the Church, and now constitutes nothing more than a miserable tributary of the *great movement of apostasy organized in all nations* for the establishment of a universal Church without dogmas or hierarchy, without rule for the spirit or check for the passions; a church which, under the pretext of liberty and human dignity, would bring back into the world, if it triumphed, with *the legal reign of cunning and force*, the oppression of the weak, of the suffering and the toiling. We are well acquainted with *the dark dens* where these deleterious doctrines, which should not seduce perceptive spirits, are elaborated".

Maritain's democracy

Maritain's "democracy", placed in the line of the Revolution, by the same token that it comprises a general philosophy of life, must be opposed to another general philosophy of life which is the philosophy of the Anti-Revolution, and as the philosophy of the Revolution is essentially constituted by naturalism, this other philosophy of the Anti-Revolution must be essentially supernatural: it constitutes *Christian civilization* itself. And as the essence of Christian civilization is lograted by the prominent place which, in the things of the only real and concrete life that men live here, is accorded to God and His Holy Religion, the essence of this philosophy consists, in short, in giving the first place, even in temporal things, to the divine rights of the Holy Church. These rights, which include the fulfillment of the supernatural and natural ordinances of the eternal Law, and thus the notion of Christian civilization intact, the Church makes no question of forms of government or political regimes. It does not question, evidently, as long as these political forms are mere *accidental* agencements, which do not substantially alter Christian civilization. For if behind this term "democracy" which, in itself, entails nothing more than the government of public affairs by the people, insofar as the true common good consents, just as aristocracy places this government in the best and monarchy in only one of the city, if behind this term there were hidden a *total philosophy of life*, different from the Catholic conception and inspired by the

maxims and formulas of Masonic enlightenment, it is evident that the Church could not accept such a democracy. And here, in substance, lies the fundamental question that arises in the much-troubled problem of democracy.

Therefore, the first question that a Catholic must ask himself in order to know whether or not he can accept a "given democracy" is to ask himself: who occupies the first place in this democratically organized city, the Church of Jesus Christ, and this by its own divine and inalienable right, or democracy itself, that is, the presumed and intangible rights of the people? Hence, and let it be well noted, once and for all, that the democratic conception that peoples are forging today and that is fixed in "modern" public law and that circulates in the language of the press and the street is *essentially* incompatible with Christian civilization. Why? Because it accords intangible rights only to the popular will which, by casting its vote, decides how the city is to be governed in religious, moral, economic and political matters. Hence "modern" democracy, essentially impious, has only been established in the world in reformed countries, such as England and the United States, after the Church was drastically eliminated from their lives, and in France, where, with the sacrilegious Civil Constitution of the Clergy, the Holy Church was banished from public life. That is why "modern" democracy carries in its entrails *the exclusion of the public sovereignty of Jesus Christ and of his Church*; and if it accords preeminence to anyone in life itself, in public law, it is to the sacrosanct will of the majority manifested in universal suffrage. This explains why Maritain, who under the pressure of the myth of democracy, supreme value of life, has made the traditional ecclesiastical conception of Christian civilization pass into the background, does not want to give to the Church the place that by divine institution corresponds to her; but that which she conquers "by virtue of internal forces developed in the bosom of the people and emanating from it, by virtue of the gift of self of men who would put themselves at the service of the common work and whose moral authority would be freely accepted..."⁵⁰¹. One wants to bring out "from below" the place that is conquered in the temporal life of the people, from where it has been ungodly excluded. Pius XI in a beautiful paragraph that in his encyclical *Ad catholici sacerdotii* dedicates to the "Priest worker of civilization", puts things in their right point. "In the midst of the aberrations of human thought, inebriated

⁵⁰¹ *Les Droits*, p. 39; English ed., p. 48.

of freedom, which has been deprived of all light and restraint; in the midst of the dreadful corruption, the fruit of human malice, it stands as a shining beacon of the Church, which condemns every deviation to the right or to the left of the truth, which indicates to everyone the path they should follow. And woe betide if even this beacon were to be extinguished, which is impossible because of the infallible promises on which it is founded, but if it were prevented from spreading its beneficial rays".

This is the problem of the temporal life of the people, which, being a truly human life, is inseparable from eternal life. That the priest must be in the first place in society, not for the sake of material privileges, which he neither needs nor seeks, but that he may make heard the word of Truth that saves. And let no one be foolish to speak of conquering this first place when impiety, triumphant in a systematic secular task, on the basis of money, propaganda and power, has rejected it and rejects it. For this reason, Pius XI continues: "We can well see with our own eyes where it has led the world to reject, in its pride, divine revelation and to follow, albeit under the specious name of science, false philosophical and moral theories". And these philosophical and moral theories which have perverted man and have prostrated him in a state of corruption and physical and moral misery are principally, and above all, as the Popes since Clement XII have taught, the very doctrines of the Revolution, of false liberty, equality, fraternity, the essence of "modern" democracy that "veiling the vagueness of ideas and the equivocation of expressions with the ardor of sentiment and the sonority of words can inflame hearts in the love of seductive but fatal causes"⁵⁰² .

The Church and the Catholic Priesthood continue to work with exemplary heroism, in spite of the disadvantaged and humiliating condition in which modern societies place them. They do so above all, because they seek to conquer the greatest number of souls possible, in the opportunities that circumstances present to them. And let the people thank them for it, because, as Pius XI says: "And if we have not yet reached a deeper abyss on the slope of error and vice, it is *due to the rays of Christian truth*, which, in spite of everything, continues to spread throughout the world". "And let these philosophers of democracy know that they want to raise the working classes,

⁵⁰² Pius X, *Letter condemning the Sillon*.

They have their own social doctrine and their own philosophical principles to reorganize society with a new plan; who have formed a special concept of human dignity, freedom, justice and fraternity, and who, in order to justify their social dreams, appeal to the Gospel, interpreted in their own way and, what is even more serious, to a disfigured and diminished Christ"⁵⁰³ , they should know that "the Church exercises her ministry of the word by means of priests suitably distributed through the various grades of the sacred hierarchy, whom she sends everywhere as indefatigable heralds of the good news, which *alone can preserve or establish, or bring about the revival of true civilization*"⁵⁰⁴ .

The Church, therefore, "the only one that can preserve or establish, or bring about the resurgence of true civilization", does not question a democratic or non-democratic regime, as she has been insistently teaching since Leo XIII; but she does question whether *under the name of "democracy"* she does not want to establish a regime of human life, essentially anti-Christian, in which she is not granted the imprescriptible rights that her divine Institution grants her.

The Church, guardian of the supernatural order brought by Jesus Christ to restore the primitive order of justice in which God created man, strengthens and consolidates the natural faculties of man and of human society. For this reason the Christian city, under the Church and at her service, gives a place of honor to the public power, which, in turn, by the compulsive force of the law, strengthens all the social relations established in the various classes which "by divine ordination" (Pius X) compose civil society, namely, as Pius X teaches⁵⁰⁵ , "princes and vassals, patrons and proletarians, rich and poor, wise and ignorant, nobles and commoners, who, all united to one another by bonds of love, help one another to attain their ultimate end in heaven, and here on earth their material and moral well-being" (*Quod apostolici muneris*).

Maritain who, with his democratic philosophy, "flatter himself by raising the human dignity and the much undervalued condition of the working classes....

⁵⁰³ Ibid.

⁵⁰⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁰⁵ *Motu proprio*, 18/XII/1903.

And to promote in humanity with deep and fruitful social movements an unexpected progress ..."⁵⁰⁶ would not be reproachable if it did not forget that "the progress of a being consists in *invigorating his natural faculties* with new forces and in facilitating the exercise of his activity within the limits and laws of his constitution; but that if on the contrary *his essential organs* are *wounded* and the limits of his activity are violated, he is pushed, *not towards progress*, but *towards death*. This is what (they) want to make of human society; their dream consists in changing its natural and traditional foundations and in promising a future city built on other principles which they dare to declare more fruitful, more beneficial than those on which the present Christian society rests"⁵⁰⁷ . Hence, after having lowered the Holy Church from the first place it deserves in society, after having weakened public authority by giving it the status of a captain of a foot-ball or field hockey team, after having eliminated all tutelage and paternalism, and of calling for a "classless" society, composed of workers alone⁵⁰⁸ , where workers and peasants assume the leading role - and all this in virtue of evangelical and Christian demands - can only end up in a communism, call it Christian, if you will, but a true communism. This is what Pius X warned about the *Sillon*, when he said of it that it made an *escort to socialism* and when he added: "it constitutes nothing but a miserable tributary of the great movement of apostasy organized in all nations for the establishment of a universal church without dogmas, without hierarchy, without rule for the spirit or check for the passions, a church that under the pretext of freedom and human dignity, would bring back to the world if it triumphed, *with the legal reign of cunning and force*, the oppression of the weak, of those who suffer and work."

Fifty-five years have passed since these words were written by the great Pontiff and *that legal reign of cunning and force* seems to begin its universal and definitive triumph. Maritain, with his satellites scattered throughout the world, has the sad mission of cooperating, within the Church, to the socialist and communist work which, with unusual fury, wants to apply universally the sinister plans *of the legal reign of cunning and force* - subscribed to in recent international Conferences. Hence

⁵⁰⁶ Pius X, *Letter condemning the Sillon*.

⁵⁰⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁰⁸ *Du Régime Temporel*, p. 67.

his works are full of sympathetic appraisals of communism, whose allegedly original *Christian* elements he wishes to emphasize.

Christian" assessment of communism

"It is important, he says, to be even more precise. Among the original elements of communism, there are also Christian elements? Communism in its preparatory phases has not been atheistic. The very idea of communion which constitutes its spiritual force and which it wants to realize in social-terrestrial life, must indeed be realized here, but not exclusively here... the very idea of communion is an idea of Christian origin"⁵⁰⁹ .

So if communism is anti-Christian, it is because Catholics did not introduce it earlier, or because they allowed themselves to be won over by "atheistic communists" - to whom was given instead of "believers wholly faithful to Catholic dogma" the imponderable grace of "abolishing in Russia the absolutism of private profit"⁵¹⁰ . This is why he says: "Communist thought as it was constituted in the second half of the 19th century and as it exists today has committed energies of Christian origin in an atheistic ideology... above all because of a Christian world unfaithful to its principles"⁵¹¹ , that is because Christians have not implanted before the *Christian* communism that Maritain now advocates.

"We would not know how to refute, he says, the surveys in good faith which show us how Soviet Russia has been able, not without bending before reality many theoretical pretensions, to make a delayed economy pass in a few years, surprising stages and which announce to us the germination in this country of "a new form of civilization" (the question is to know what is its value); this new form of civilization is born into existence after the sacrifice of millions of human lives, and irreparable losses; the positive elements that it contains, let us say briefly in the

⁵⁰⁹ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 48.

⁵¹⁰ *Christ. et Dém.* p. 44; English ed. p. 49.

⁵¹¹ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 49.

Insofar as it is possible to pronounce from afar, and on written documents, they are summarized in our opinion, in the liquidation of the profit system ("profit à faire") and of the servitude of human labor-power to the fecundity of money (liquidation appreciable above all in relation to future forms, because for the moment it has for ration a heavy statism, but in the end it explains the great hope aroused in many elements of the working world by the Russian experience) ; and in the effort in perpetual renewal to establish, at least in the order of the morphology of the laws, a

The "multiform democracy" integrating the human multitude into the social, political and cultural life of the community. However harshly the human being lives and is treated there, there is at least the feeling in this country, in which consecutive servitude and custom had lasted so long, that a secular social humiliation has ceased"⁵¹² .

Thus, for Maritain there are three good things in atheistic communism, namely: suppression of profit, suppression of all servitude and establishment of a multiform democracy, let us say *pluralistic*. These three positive and therefore praiseworthy elements enter into the famous Maritainian Christianity, as we have opportunely seen. But there is also room for the famous *fraternal friendship* and it touches Maritain in an irrepressible way, according to what he writes⁵¹³ . "For the first time in history, wrote Maximo Gorky recently, regarding Soviet communism, the true love of man is organized as a creative force and proposes itself as an object the emancipation of millions of workers. We believe in the profound sincerity of these words of Gorky and of the sentiment they express and we consider as very important the fact that this theme of the love of the human being, of which nothing prevents that in the deepest of history its origins are Christian, arises now in a current of thought that under materialistic influences has not wanted for a long time to accord to it only an inferior and sentimental value". Hence, for Maritain, if communism "were only an economic system, one could conceive, whatever the intrinsic value of such a system, a Christian communism"⁵¹⁴ .

⁵¹² *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 91.

⁵¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

⁵¹⁴ *Christianisme et Démocratie*, p. 92; English ed. p. 102.

Marc Sangnier, so severely censured by Pius X, falls short of Maritain's "communist" audacity.

In *La lutte pour la Démocratie*⁵¹⁵ in an article entitled *Beyond Socialism*, Marc Sangnier, seeking to overcome the collectivist dream of Jaurès and the narrow conception of Clemenceau's radicalism, adds: "The country will finally realize that the socialists retain reactionary mentalities even in the solutions they advocate for the new problems they pose. It will overcome socialism and will then discover before it this free and fraternal Democracy of which our friends have never ceased to be the indefatigable apostles". And in a speech of February 1905 he says: "There is nothing more awkward and more humiliating than to be anti-socialists. In truth, comrades, we are not grouped together to combat socialism but because we have a positive ideal that we want to realize. We do not want to destroy socialism, we want to purify it, transform it, absorb it into the great movement of French democracy"⁵¹⁶.

Maritain, for his part, wants to purify it, transform it, absorb it into the great movement of universal democracy. How he reconciles his attempt with the clear and categorical directives of the Popes who, from Leo XIII in *Rerum Novarum* and *Graves de communi* to Pius XI in *Quadragesimo anno*, in *Charitate Christi* and in *Divini Redemptoris*, have expressed that "*religious socialism, Christian socialism, are contradictory terms, no one can be at the same time a good Catholic and a true socialist*", we do not know. What we do know is how wise and prophetic were the words of Leo XIII who, on October 8, 1898, said, among other things, to numerous French pilgrims who, with Leo Harmel at their head, represented the "F r a n c e d u Travail".

"...If democracy is inspired by the teachings of reason enlightened by faith, if, while remaining vigilant against fallacious and subversive theories, it *accepts with a religious resignation and como a necessary fact the diversity of classes and conditions*, if in the search for possible solutions to the multiple social problems that arise daily, it does not lose sight for an instant of the rules of that superhuman charity which Jesus Christ declared to be the characteristic note of his own, if, in a word, democracy wants to be Christian, it will give your country, a future

⁵¹⁵ *Lutte pour la Démocratie*, p. 67.

⁵¹⁶ *Discours*, t. I, p. 319.

of peace, prosperity and happiness..... If, on the contrary, *it gives itself up to revolution and socialism*; if, deluded by mad illusions, *it gives itself up to demands destructive of the fundamental laws*, on which the whole civil order rests, the immediate effect will be for the working class, servitude, misery, ruin...". And in *Graves de comunni*, reacting energetically the old pontiff, 91 years old at the time, against the socialist spirit that was invading the social Catholicism of France and Italy especially, he warns him saying: "The socialists slip skillfully into the bosom of society both in the darkness of their secretos convents and in the light of day, by word and by pen, they push the multitude to rebellion. *They do not concern themselves with their duties, but exalt their rights....*" and he added: "Let those who exercise the apostolate among the people, animated by the same zeal and in opportune time, apply themselves, therefore, to make penetrate into the soul of the people, in fraternal conversations, the principal maxims such as these: *to guard against seditions and seditionists*; *to respect as inviolable the rights of others*; to accord to patrons or masters (dominis) the just respect and work due; not to take annoyance from domestic life, so rich in all kinds of goods; above all, to practice religion, and to seek in it the sure consolation for the difficulties of life"⁵¹⁷ .

Maritain's famous Christianity is a *supercommunist city*, a synthesis of the American libertarian city and the Russian communist city. This is the dynamic image that moves his whole discursive process, this "*fraternal city* where man is liberated from misery and servitude"⁵¹⁸ . Hence the *pathos* that the adventure of the *Pilgrim Fathers* in search of earthly happiness arouses in Maritain; *pathos* that seems to set in motion who knows what atavistic complexes that only God knows and can make souls vibrate; hence the *tone* - that tone- that his most recent and popular works denounce, humanitarian, fraternal, that seems to link him to a universality that is not the majestic Catholicity -a tone that acquires a peculiar emotion and timbre when he evokes the United States-. But one thing seems to reproach this great country and that is its economy of private profit. "In America - says⁵¹⁹ - in spite of the power of the great economic interests, democracy has penetrated much more deeply into existence and where it never forgot

⁵¹⁷ *Graves de comunni*, 18/II/1901.

⁵¹⁸ *Les Droits*, p. 65; English ed., p. 78.

⁵¹⁹ *Christ. et Dém.* p. 37; English ed. p. 38.

his Christian origins...". Russia also arouses his warm and fervent admiration and the Russian experience, not the universal one but even the particular one in some sectors of the economy, such as that of the Stakhanovist worker, seems to move him as if he had found the *formative* principle of the *new* humanity. But he reproaches Russia for one thing: its totalitarianism. "According to the documents, he writes, to which it seems reasonable to give credit, let us say briefly that in our opinion, the profound evils of the Russian "new civilization" are summed up in the communist totalitarianism that carries to the maximum the terrible risks that every strong collective organization entails"⁵²⁰ .

Thus, if on the basis of the present Russian or American civilization, a regime of life could be achieved in which private profit and totalitarianism would be extirpated, Maritain's fraternal city would have been established, as a foretaste of "the coming of the kingdom of God and the land of the risen ones"⁵²¹ . What else is his famous personalist democracy but a universal city, where all emancipated human persons have acquired the full consciousness of their dignity, free from subjection, free from servitude, free from inequalities and inequities, true gods on earth, a foretaste of the new heavens of the Resurrection?⁵²² .

And what else does Marx teach: "Human emancipation will only be realized when the real individual man will have absorbed the abstract citizen, when como individual man in his empirical life, in his individual work, in his individual relations, will have become a generic being and will have recognized his own forces as social forces and will have organized them himself como such, and will therefore no longer separate from himself the social force in the form of political power"⁵²³ .

And what else does *atheistic Communism* aim at, according to *Divini Redemptoris*? Pius XI says there: "When all have acquired the collective qualities, in that utopian condition of a society without any class differences, the

⁵²⁰ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 92.

⁵²¹ *Christ. et Dém.* p. 54; English ed. p. 59.

⁵²² *Les Droits*, p. 131; English ed., pp. 133 ff.

⁵²³ Quoted by Charles de Koninck in *Primauté du bien commun*, p. 183.

Political State, which is now conceived only as an instrument of capitalist domination over the proletariat, will lose all its *raison d'être* and "dissolve".

And what else did Rousseau dream of with his primitive man, and what else did he intend with his libertarian education? And what else have the heretical sects proposed, throughout the twenty centuries of Christian history, but to discover that *new*, emancipated man here on earth?

Thus, at the end of the provisional stages, both the ideal city, imagined in the brain of Rousseauian liberalism, and the one dreamed of by Marx's socialism and Russian communism, or the one desired by Lamennais, Marc Sangnier, Maritain or the one attempted by the secular heretics, destroyers of Christianity, coincide in inaugurating on earth the universal city of Fraternity, in which, religious, economic, political and social differences disappearing on the plane of temporal life, man in the fullness of his dignity, in the vigor of his conscience and responsibility, will live in a *City of brothers*.

THE NEW CHRISTENDOM, CITY OF THE REVOLUTION

And what company can there be between light and darkness? Or what concord between Christ and Belial? (II Cor. 6:14).

After having altered the very notion of Christianity, Maritain draws the plans of a city substantially naturalistic and unnatural, in which public authority is corrupted, the organic relations of the economic-social order are subverted and *the legal reign of cunning and force* is erected. It is the city of the Revolution, the work of the Masonic counter-church that intends to rebuild on earth the mighty city of Enoch, universal fraternal city, where Jubal, father of the singers, and Tubalcain, craftsman in hammering all kinds of copper and iron work⁵²⁴ -city of Pleasure and Work- prepare the fortress of the Antichrist. With its construction, the earthly cycle of the city of evil so grandly referred to Cain by St. Augustine, when he writes: "The first born of our first parents was Cain who belongs to the city of men, and then Abel who belongs to the city of God Thus Holy Scripture says of Cain that he founded a city; but Abel, as a pilgrim, did not found it, because the city of the saints is sovereign and heavenly even though it produces on earth citizens."

Maritain in his *Antimoderne* had no difficulty in recognizing the "persevering and skillful" action of "the Masonic counter-church"⁵²⁵ painfully noting that "one of the causes that have most seriously weakened many modern Catholics and favored in them liberalism, Americanism, modernism, etc., is the infiltration into their souls of the Masonic dogmas of necessary Progress and humanitarian Optimism, sentimental pseudo-ideals which respond to the secret desire of nature to accept the

⁵²⁴ Gen., IV, 22.

⁵²⁵ *Antimoderne*, Éditions de la Revue des Jeunes, Paris, 1922, p. 198.

fait accompli and with unequaled power to cloud judgment"⁵²⁶ . And this is said to underline the encyclical *Terrebat nos quam maxime* in which the Supreme Pontiff Pius X affirms that whoever "weighs these things has the right to fear that such perversion of the spirits is not the beginning of the sorrows announced for the end of time and as their making contact with the earth, and that truly the *son of perdition* of whom the Apostle speaks has not already made his advent among us"⁵²⁷ .

The Masonic plan. The Masonic world does not cease to speak of *liberty*, *equality*, *fraternity*; it frequently praises *the state of nature*; it *celebrates truth*, *virtue*, *morality*; it speaks of a new *religion*. These expressions contain, in their very vagueness, the marvelous quality of being accepted by everyone, whatever the conception of life they profess. Who can reject *liberty* and prefer slavery to it? Who can love irritating inequalities and not desire *equality*? Who can prefer hatred to *fraternity*? On the other hand, who is not a witness or protagonist of some irritating abuse against liberty, equality, fraternity, so as not to be inflamed with holy enthusiasm, before the evocative power of these words? This is why Freemasonry works with the word *liberty*, which of itself says pure and absolute independence, to break every bond of divine and human subjection; with the word equality, which of itself indicates absolute leveling, it tends to break every divine and human hierarchy: "*each man is his priest and his king, his pope and his emperor*" (F. Potvin.⁵²⁸). "*We answer for our acts only to ourselves, we are our own priests and our own gods*" (F. Lacroix⁵²⁹). "*Enough of God, enough of churches, there will be no more priests or kings; enough of reyes, enough of leaders, there will be no more useless burdens*" (F. Fleury⁵³⁰); with the word *fraternity* he designates the *community of nature and of rights, or the equality of all in the possession of the same liberty*.

⁵²⁶ Ibid., p. 207.

⁵²⁷ Ibid., p. 205.

⁵²⁸ Dorn Paul Benoit, *La cité anticrétienne*, La Franc-Maçonnerie, 2 éd., 1891. t. I. pp. 408 ff.

⁵²⁹ Ibid.

⁵³⁰ Ibid.

Since then, the plan of the Masonic temple is clearly drawn. *Freedom*, destruction of all authority. *Equality*, destruction of all hierarchy. *Fraternity*, on the one hand, community of rights and goods, on the other hand, mutual assistance for the common good in general and for the pleasures of sense in particular. A single one of these words comprises the whole plan of the temple. *Freedom*: there are neither masters nor slaves, but *free* men. *Equality*: there are no more superiors or inferiors, but *equals*. *Fraternity*: there are no more fathers and sons, but *brothers*. Therefore: *Liberty*, destruction of religion, of civil society, of the family, of property. *Equality*, destruction of religion, civil society, family and property. *Fraternity*, destruction of religion, civil society, family and property. The Masonic temple will return to humanity, the state of happiness -the *golden age*- primitive that the artificial and oppressive society has made it lose. We could accumulate Masonic texts of the famous *illuminati* of Weishaupt, of the *Carbanarians*, of Saint Martin, of Rousseau and of Voltaire in which this constant program of Freemasonry appears.

Let us limit ourselves to brief quotations from Rousseau and Voltaire, the two sophists with the most visible influence on the French Revolution. In the *Discourse on the Inequality of Conditions*, Rousseau says, speaking of the state of nature: "*Man's first sentiment was that of his existence; his first care, that of his preservation. The productions of the earth supplied him with all the necessary succor; instinct led him to make use of them. Hunger, other appetites, made him alternately experience various ways of existing; and there was one that invited him to perpetuate his species; and this blind inclination, devoid of all feeling of heart, produced nothing but a purely animal act. The need being satisfied, the two sexes no recognized each other any longer; and the son meant nothing to his mother, as soon as he could dispense with her. Such was the condition of man at birth.*" In the state of nature, therefore, there was neither religious society, nor civil society, nor even domestic society. Men wandered at random, without cultivating the land, living on the fruits that the soil produced spontaneously, moving in or out, according to the attraction of the moment.

"*The first who, after fencing a piece of land, had the foresight to say: this is mine and found people so simple to believe him, was the true founder of civil society. How many crimes, wars, murders, miseries and horrors would he not have spared the*

human race who, pulling up the stakes or plugging the holes, would have cried out to his fellows: "Beware of listening to this impostor, you are lost, if you forget that the fruits belong to all and the earth to none"⁵³¹. Thus all evils have arisen from individual property and the social state. From which it must be concluded that to put an end to them it is necessary to suppress property and destroy society.

"If we follow the progress of inequality in its different revolutions, we shall find that the establishment of law and the right of property was its first term, the institution of the magistracy the second, that the third and last was the change of legitimate power into arbitrary power, so that the state of rich and poor was introduced in the first epoch, that of powerful and weak in the second, and in the third that of master and slave, which is the last degree of inequality and the term in which at last all the others end, until new revolutions completely dissolve government"⁵³². Consequently, men cannot enjoy equality, if there are laws, property, magistrates, any power; therefore Freemasonry, to establish equality, must abolish laws, suppress property, exterminate magistrates, annihilate all religious, civil or domestic power.

Here is what the impious sophist Voltaire says for his part: "*It is clear that when men enjoy faculties attached to their nature, they are equal; they are equal when they perform animal functions, and when they exercise their understanding...*". This is the fundamental principle of Freemasonry.

A horse no tells the horse his brother; let them comb my beautiful mane, let them harness and shoe me. Thou, run and go carry my sovereign commands to the mule of these shores, to the asses my neighbors. Thou, prepare the grains with which I make largesse to my favorite nobles, to my sweet maidens..... All sovereignty, all social hierarchy is against nature, as much among men as among animals; these have remained in a state of nature, the former have gone out. Here is the conclusion that **f o l l o w s** from the words of the sophist.

"Animals naturally have, below us, the advantage of independence. If a bull feasting on a calf is driven off with the horns by another

⁵³¹ Ibid.

⁵³² Ibid.

stronger bull, goes to look for another companion in another meadow, and lives free. A rooster defeated by another rooster consoles himself in another pen. It is not so with us. Marriage hinders freedom of inclinations; let us destroy marriage, let us live after the manner of animals, and man will be free and woman will be free.

"In this natural state which all untamed quadrupeds, birds and reptiles enjoy, man would be as happy as they are". Thus Freemasonry, which wants to give all men the happiness of animals, is eminently philanthropic. "Domination would then be a chimera, an absurdity of which no one would think; why seek servants when you have no need of any service? If it should pass through the head of any individual, tyrannical-headed and sinewy-armed, to serve his neighbor less strong than himself, the thing would be impossible, the oppressed would be upon the Danube before the oppressor had taken his measure upon the Volga." That is to say: all exercise of public power is tyrannical: let us annihilate all authority, let us destroy all authority and we shall be happy⁵³³.

These were the dangerous sophisms that were hidden in "the mine that beneath the thrones and altars were dug by revolutionaries much deeper and more active than the encyclopedists.

"An association composed of men of every country, of every religion, of every rank, bound together by symbolic conventions, bound under oath to keep inviolably the secret of their inner existence, subjected to dismal trials, engaged in fantastic ceremonies, but otherwise practicing beneficence, and holding themselves to be equal, though divided into three classes: *apprentices, companions and masters*, in this consists Freemasonry, mystical institution that some link with the ancient initiations of Egypt, and that others make descend from a confraternity of architects already formed in the third century.

"Now, on the eve of the French Revolution, Freemasonry had acquired an immense development. Diffused throughout Europe, it seconded the meditative genius of Germany, agitated deafly France and presented in

⁵³³ Ibid.

everywhere the image of a society founded on principles contrary to those of civil society"⁵³⁴ .

The Freemasonic societies, heirs of the ancient Gnostic and Manichean sects, claim to be in possession "of a sublime Christianity", "the true Christianity preached by Jesus Christ", which the Roman pontiffs have never known or altered and which has been transmitted in "its original purity" within "schools and sanctuaries subtracted from the profane". This "primitive", "wise" and "philosophical" Christianity, which the sectarians oppose to the "vulgar and coarse" Christianity, is the Christianity of the Revolution, whose plans were spread by the great sophist Rousseau.

This is why the Revolution was prepared and carried out in the name of *Christianity*. "Rousseau is above all," wrote Maritain, "the one who has denaturalized the Gospel by wresting it from the supernatural order, transporting certain profound aspects of Christianity to the plane of simple nature. Absolutely essential to Christianity is the supernaturalness of grace. Take away this supernaturalness, Christianity is corrupted. What do we find at the origin of the modern disorder? A *naturalization* of Christianity. It is clear that the Gospel made purely natural (and therefore absolutely corrupted) becomes a ferment of revolution of extraordinary virulence... this is why we find everywhere in the modern world degraded analogies of Catholic mysticism and shreds of secularized Christianity"⁵³⁵ .

"The revolution was made in the name of the Gospel; and Abbé Fauchet, whose voice stirred and enchanted the people, of great stature, the black hair of a warrior, the look of an apostle, and the smile of a woman, from the top of the sacred cathedra, inflamed the crowds to freedom with that text of St. Paul: "*Vos enim ad libertatem vocati estis, fratres.*" "You have been called to freedom, brothers"⁵³⁶ .

⁵³⁴ Louis Le Blanc, *Histoire de la Révolution Française*, II, p. 267, ed. 1878.

⁵³⁵ *Trois Réformateurs*, Librairie Plon, Paris, p. 204.

⁵³⁶ Louis Le Blanc, *ibid.*, II, pp. 293ff.

The anti-Christian Revolution that has triumphed with the Reformation, with the French Revolution and with Communism, has been carried out, with the Gospel in hand, to establish the true Christianity of *Liberty, Equality and Fraternity*; Christianity realized in the very substance of the profane, of earthly and temporal reality. This is why the Revolution is Progress, and in a certain and true sense, the kingdom of God. So deep is this "Christian imprint" of the Revolution that it is proclaimed with the most fanatical profession of atheism, that it is to be found, whether in Marxist or Prudhonnian communism, of a Feuerbach for example, cannily hostile to the Catholic Church, or in a Saint Simon, of naive sympathy towards it. Famous are the exhortations that, in the mouth of Luther, Saint Simon addresses to the Pope with his *Nouveau christianisme*: "Your predecessors have sufficiently perfected the theory of Christianity, they have sufficiently propagated it; it is necessary that you now take care of the application of the doctrine. True Christianity must make men happy not only in heaven, but also on earth. Your task is to organize the human race according to the fundamental principle of divine morality. It is not fitting that you should limit yourselves to preaching to the faithful that the poor are the beloved children of God; it is necessary that you should use, frankly and energetically, all the powers and all the means of the Church militant, to improve promptly the physical and moral state of the most numerous class"⁵³⁷ .

Bucheze, for his part⁵³⁸ , writes: "The French Revolution is the ultimate and most advanced consequence of modern civilization, and modern civilization has emerged entirely from the Gospel. It is an irrefutable fact, if one studies history, particularly that of our country, and if one analyzes the events and their driving ideas. It is also an undeniable fact if one examines and compares with the doctrine of Jesus all the principles that the Revolution inscribed on its banners and in its codes, and these words of equality and fraternity that it placed at the head of all its acts and with which it justified all its works".

The proposal of a "Christian" evaluation of the Revolution and particularly of the French Revolution, its highest exponent, deserves careful consideration. If the Revolution is, in substance, a process of social demands for the betterment of humanity, above all in its most vulnerable classes, the Revolution is a process of social demands for the betterment of humanity, above all in its most vulnerable classes.

⁵³⁷ C. H. de Saint Simon, *Oeuvres choisies, Le nouveau christianisme*, t. III, p. 350, Bruxelles, 1859.

⁵³⁸ *Histoire Parlementaire de la Révolution Française*.

Even if we have to deplore the evils that, in the excess of an uncontrolled overflow, may have accompanied it, such as revolts against religion and public power, crimes, even regicide, we should consider it "*simpliciter*" good, good in the strict sense of the word.

And if the revolutionary process is "*simpliciter*" good, nothing could be more consistent than for the Church, which blesses and sanctifies all good, whatever it may be and whatever its origin, because all good comes from the Father of Lights, as the Apostle James says⁵³⁹ , to reconcile itself with the Revolution and even to bless it.

If, on the contrary, the Revolution consisted, in substance, in a process of estrangement from God, it is evident that it would not be necessary to think of its conciliation with the Holy Church, although many and great goods, *accidentally* achieved and therefore separable from it, could accompany it.

The Catholic evaluation of the modern revolutionary process involves two diametrically opposed attitudes: one of acceptance, the other of repudiation.

Christianity".

The Catholic liberalism that began with Lamennais consists, substantially, only in a conciliatory attitude of the Catholic Truth with the Masonic Dogmas of the Progress of humanity. But the conciliation could not be effected without causing the very concept of Christianity to undergo an alteration whose principal moments should be borne in mind. The modern world has created the notion of a Christianity without the Church. Balmes energetically denounced this⁵⁴⁰ . In reality," he says, "the true, the only Christianity is Catholicism, but there is now the sad necessity of not being able to use these words indistinctly; and this is not only because of the Protestants, but because of that monstrous philosophical nomenclature which has been created by the Church.

⁵³⁹ I, 17.

⁵⁴⁰ *Protestantism compared to Catholicism.*

Christianity that never forgets to mix Christianity with philosophical sects".

A century from when Balmes wrote this, this error has taken new and far more dangerous forms. If we wanted to discover its full depth, we would have to make a long and careful philosophy of the whole of modern history.

The Protestants, with their errors of rebellion against the Catholic Church, the only depository of the divine Promises, laid the foundations of the Counter-Church where the Antichrist will be enthroned, when the hour of his manifestation arrives. But before that hour arrives, that Counter-Church, officially founded by Protestantism and not precisely by Luther but by Calvin, has to fulfill a history of three stages. The properly Protestant stage, the rationalist or deistic stage, and the universal, materialistic or political stage.

The first two have already passed; we are entering the third and last one. Let us characterize these three stages of the Counter-Church.

The Protestant stage

The Protestants, determined to destroy the Catholic Church, which presented itself as the only visible Institution, heir of the promises that save, established that the Church of Jesus Christ was invisible, formed by those who truly felt justified and predestined, whose number was known only to God. And then, the visible churches, the confessions of believers, what sense did they have? They are, they said, of purely human institution and can vary and multiply. And they can and, to some extent must, be national. So the Catholic Church -within the Protestant logic- is at least as legitimate as the Reformed confessions? Not at all. Because it lacks a note of guarantee that every confession must be stamped with to be legitimate, namely, the naked word of God and the legitimate use of the Sacraments. Therefore, the Catholic Church is reprobate. She is the Babylon of the Antichrist.

In this first stage of the Counter-Church, when the climate of the world was still full of the supernatural sense of life, the Reformers established an invisible religion - with universal destiny - from which papist Catholics are certainly excluded: a Christianity outside the Catholic Church.

The rationalist stage

Two hundred years after the Protestant rebellion, the world no longer reacts on a religious plane, but on a rationalist plane. Everything has been secularized. Religions continue to exist, *but without vital influence*, because the point of gravitation of human life has shifted from God to man, from the transcendent to the immanent. Just as the concern, in past ages, was to inquire into what God had established in order to adjust one's conduct to it, now one seeks in man himself, the rule of his life and even the whole of creation.

On this plane of life, on which man is now placed, what expression, what reply does that Counter-Church of the Reformers find? Denied all that can transcend man's conscience, we must seek within the human heart what concerns its health, that is, divinity itself. Jesus Christ was the model of this immanent worship, of which the other founders of religions have left us not so perfect samples. The different religions must be seen as accessory manifestations of this spiritual and interior worship which alone is valid. But just as Protestantism taught that all evangelical confessions that preached the word of God and used the "legitimate" sacraments were substantially "Christian," to the exclusion of the Catholic Church, so now the rationalists admit the identity of all religions as exoteric expressions of an immanent universal cult, from which only the Catholic cult should be excluded because of its openly transcendent and dogmatic character.

The democratic stage

After the war of 1914, rationalism has been overcome. Overcome, I say, not suppressed, because it has entered a stage that contains it *eminenter*

as it also contains all the errors of the past centuries. Already today, man does not react rationally, nor does he react religiously. His reaction is *a turbid mixture of religion, reason, instinct, affections, passions, matter*. It is an unnamed thing that can express everything and that expresses nothing determined. It is a Freudianism which on the most external plane of man's life, on the plane of political manifestation, *is the new universal religion of Liberty and Democracy*: it is the new "Christianity". Are you Catholic, Protestant, schismatic, infidel, Jew, atheist? It does not matter. If you believe in Liberty and Democracy, you are a perfect "Christian", you are part of the great and universal religion, from which are excluded only as unrepentant reprobates, all those who do not want to worship the god-freedom and the god-democracy.

Thus, as the Protestants sought the guarantee of belonging to the invisible Church of God in the feeling of being justified, the latter seek it in the idolatry of Liberty and Democracy. And as the former affirmed the accessory and variable nature of religious confessions, so did the latter, even atheism. And as the only thing that the former did not tolerate was the Catholic Church, the latter, more insolent and audacious, even dare to open the doors of their new religion, also to Catholics, as long as they formulate the profession of democratic faith.

In the materialistic plano to which humanity has arrived, after the 400 years of the Protestant Reformation, the new religion of Liberty and Democracy, is the replica of the Calvinist Counter-Church, now expanded to all areas of the world, and having at its disposal all the forces that, without violence, are capable of moving individuals and peoples.

In this spirit of communion in Liberty and Democracy, the new and universal "Christianity" spread throughout the world, on the wings of universal propaganda.

There is a continuity in that Counter-Church of the Reformers and this very modern one of the new "Christians". Christianity" has expanded, descending at the same time to lower and coarser levels of expression. In the Counter-Church of the Protestants there were only those who made profession of faith in Christ, except Catholics; in that of the rationalists, those who maintained an interior communication with the divinity whatever their

worship or

religion, as long as it springs from the immanence of the subject, whereby Catholics who only accept a transcendent religion were excluded; in the novísima of the democratists, believers and non-believers enter, and even Catholics who agree with the idolatry of Democracy; And as these impious ones do not discard the possibility of conquering for this cause the Church itself -if possible- their dream is a united Humanity -above the Church- before the altar of the new Idol, which they call "Christianity".

With this "philosophical" sense of the philosophy condemned by St. Paul, the notion of Christianity in whose name the Revolution was made is charged.

The justification of the revolution in Lamennais and Catholic liberalism

Lamennais was the first Catholic to speak of catholicizing the liberalism of the Revolution. "One trembles before liberalism; catholicize it and society will be reborn"⁵⁴¹.

He considers liberalism founded on individual reason as a provisional stage, a crisis of growth, through which humanity must necessarily pass on its way to progress.

"God has willed," says Lamennais, "that society should advance perpetually towards a term which it cannot attain on earth, but to which it must always approach..." "the first and fundamental law, by virtue of which mankind tends to detach itself progressively from the bonds of childhood as by the growth and development of intelligence, emancipated by Christianity, peoples reach, as it were, the age of man: For what is true of him is also true of society, and, like him, it must go through the successive phases of life, in order to arrive, in *the unity of faith and in the knowledge of the Son of God*, at the *age of the perfect man*, at the beginning of that great age which the Apostle calls the *age of the fullness of Christ* (Eph. IV, 13) and which, consummating here below, insofar as it can be, the emancipation of the human race, will place it in possession of its rights.

⁵⁴¹ Lettre du 30 janvier 1829, in *Oeuvres Completes*, Société Belge de Librairie, 1839, Bruxelles.

primitive or of the holy freedom that the Savior God has come to restore to our regenerated nature"⁵⁴² .

"Let there be no objection," continues Lamennais⁵⁴³ , "to the anti-Christian character which modern revolutions have manifested in various countries. They prove that this character is foreign to them in what they have of fundamental and durable, that everywhere where they retain it, they fail after short moments of despotism and anarchy. They are consolidated only where Catholics take possession of it and from it they bring out true liberty".

Together with the justification of the Revolution, the conception of naturalistic Christianity, a factor of social emancipation, unfailingly appears. A characteristic note that should never be absent in Catholic liberalism and that likewise acquires singular force in Maritain. "Christianity - continues Lamennais⁵⁴⁴ - found the world a slave: its political mission was to emancipate it. By proclaiming the reign of intelligence, the supremacy of the *spirit* over the *flesh*, of reason over force, of right over fact, it established the immutable and sacred foundation of freedom inseparable from order, all the greater as order is more perfect, because order and freedom are confused in their source, infinite one and the other in God".

The Revolution then that aims to emancipate the people from tyranny coincides substantially with Christianity which is the deep engine of modern progressive change. "That if one considers - writes⁵⁴⁵ - the July Revolution from this height where intrigues and passions disappear which, mixed to all political catastrophes, do not characterize any.... And without being deceived by what this revolution has had of sudden and fortuitous in appearance, one will see in it not an isolated fact, one of these accidents that sometimes baffle the most wise foresight, but the inevitable effect of an ancient impulse, the continuation of the great movement that, spreading from the regions of thought in the political world towards 1789, announced to the sleeping nations in the bosom

⁵⁴² Ibid., vol. II, p. 460.

⁵⁴³ *De L'Avenir de la société*, of 28/V1/1831 in *Oeuvres Completes*, II, p. 459.

⁵⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁴⁵ Ibid.

of a corrupted civilization and a worn-out order, the fall of this order and the birth of a new order".

Without the elegance and originality that must be recognized to Lamennais, these concepts have been repeated by Catholic liberal and democratic writers and speakers, with a Rousseauian, Saintsimmonian, Victor-Huguesque, Tolstoyan, Bergsonian language, according to the emotional note of the writer, but always murky, like everything that originates in the depths of the conscience, without the control of the discernment of the intelligence. In a *prospectus* essay of the journal *l'Ere Nouvelle* which, in 1848, founded l'abbé Maret, Ozanam and Lacordaire, we read:

"The principles of 1789 and 1830, the ideas of the French Revolution, separated from all the evil of the passions mixed up in it, can still constitute the political era of Christianity and the Gospel. We see there a possible and ever more perfect application of this spirit of justice and charity, of this principle of human dignity, given to the world by divine revelation. We see there at the same time one of the most beautiful conquests of reason, always in conformity, in its true progress, with divine revelation. The political and social form which may result from the sincere and real, but prudent, application of these principles seems to us the most perfect that men have yet known. This political and social form bears the great name of democracy"⁵⁴⁶. The same Abbé Maret had written: "Modern democracy, the culmination of all social progress, is eminently Christian"⁵⁴⁷.

This movement of conciliation between *modern* democracy, born of the Revolution, and the Church, was attempted, in the middle of the 19th century, by Montalembert and Bishop Dupanloup with the known success of having provoked the promulgation of the *Syllabus*; but, at the end of the same century, during the pontificate of Leo XIII, a veiled justification of Lamennais' position was attempted. It is echoed by Georges Goyau⁵⁴⁸, when he says: "Between the tendencies of Lamennais and those of the current "social Christians" there are few differences and

⁵⁴⁶ Quoted by Emmanuel Barbier, *Histoire du Catholicisme liberal et du Catholicisme social en France*, Imprimerie J. Cadoret, Bordeaux, t. III, p. 79. Cadoret, Bordeaux, t. III, p. 79.

⁵⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁴⁸ *Autour du catholicisme social* (Deux. series, p. 10, 1910).

perhaps none: on both sides you will perceive this generous and apostolic desire to make God reign among the masses and not to suffer Christian workers, because of economic circumstances, to be lowered below the dignity of men? Under the pontificate of Leo XIII the Christian social ideas that were expounded or hinted at in *l' Avenir* have found their homeland again. Like lightning, whose course cannot be followed, and whose origin and scope cannot be known, they flashed through the journal of Lamennais; today they shine with self-assurance, with continuous brilliance because they have in the Doctors of the Church an authentic and venerable paternity. They no longer feel daring; they feel more and more true. Having discovered, once again, their right of city in the dogma, they have entered haughtily in the spirits, asking no longer, as in 1830, to be tolerated, but to reign".

The Dominican Vincent Maumus, one of the most authoritative representatives of this tendency, writes⁵⁴⁹ : "The States General of 1789 were, then, a counter-revolution, that is to say, a return to national traditions... what happened in 1789 is called a revolution, we, on the contrary, believe it was a counter-revolution, but since words have secondary importance, we will give the movement of 1789 the same name by which it is generally designated, that is, *revolution*.... This word has been interpreted in two ways, so different, that they are in no way alike. For some, the revolution is simply the reaction against the ancien régime, the proclamation of political liberty and equality before the law.... these two facts, which summarize the movement of 1789, are in no way contrary to the spirit and doctrine of the Church". We could multiply testimonies in the same sense, and with the same emphasis from Father Lecanuet, from Abbé Gayraud, Lemire, Naudet, Garnier, Dabry, and from laymen like Brunetière, Piou, Lamy, Leroy-Beaulieu. But to hear one of them is to hear them all. Let us transcribe the picturesque words of M. Etienne Lamy⁵⁵⁰ , on the occasion of the fourteenth centenary of the baptism of Clovis:

"In vain, the first words spoken by France in 1789, at the very moment when she declared herself sovereign, were to renounce this religious ministry (that of minister [sergent] of Christ). As long as she renounced it, God did not

⁵⁴⁹ Madrid, 1902, pp. 170 ff.

⁵⁵⁰ *France chrétienne devant l'histoire*, 1896.

It listened, remembering the services rendered in the past and seeing the forces always ready for the future. And the Revolution, in spite of this, confessed to the Christianity from which it was born; because *the liberty, the equality, the fraternity which it believed it had discovered had been revealed to men for eighteen centuries, by the Gospel, and there it had learned them*".

It was in this murky and sentimental atmosphere that Marc Sangnier and the leaders of the *Sillon* were formed, who would later write: "The Revolution of 1793 was not anti-religious. A Robespierre, Danton, Desmoulin, were deeply religious... their religious philosophy, the very substance of the Christianity of which France lived"⁵⁵¹ . "It would be dangerous, in a fever of reaction against social disorganization, born of Rousseau's theories and the crises of '89, to ignore what is truly Christian in the temperament of the revolutionaries and even in the *Declaration of the Rights of Man*. This respect for the individual, this acute sense of the infinite value of a single human soul, this affirmation that man has rights conferred by nature prior to any written law, are *true and pure Christianity*".

It is not surprising that, led from abyss to abyss, *abyssus abyssum invocat*, they baptized as "true Christians Victor Hugo, Combeferre, Courbeyrac, because everyone who admits this ideal of beauty, justice and goodness, are with us even if they are unjust to Catholicism and abhor it"⁵⁵² ; It is not surprising that in 1905 Marc Sangnier was moved, writing in the *Univers*, about Gorky, of "these anarchists of mystical and deep soul, of murky and sweet dreams that Holy Russia piously encloses in her vast bosom, as disturbing germs of revolt and strange seduction.... let us discover to them the true Christianity and they will throw themselves on it *eperdûment*, madly, as on the painful term of "their restless searches""⁵⁵³ .

⁵⁵¹ *Le Sillon*, April 25, 1907.

⁵⁵² *Ibid.*, October 21, 1901.

⁵⁵³ *Les idées du Sillon*, p. 116.

This attempt to baptize the city of the Revolution brings to mind those words of St. Augustine in the *City of God*⁵⁵⁴ : "And this is proper to the earthly city, to revere and serve God or the gods to reign, with their favor, with many victories and in earthly peace, not for love and charity to govern and look after others, but for greed to reign; because the good make use of the world to come to enjoy God; but the bad, on the contrary, to enjoy the world want to serve God, at least those who believe that there is God, or who care for human things, because those who do not even believe this are much worse."

*The justification of the revolution, in the name of Christianity, by
Maritain*

Up to this point we have been able to verify a manifest affinity between the theses and formulas of Freemasonry and of the Revolution and Catholic liberalism. No one will think it unfair to describe Catholic liberals as fifth columnists of the Revolution, infiltrators of Christian civilization. Undoubtedly, they must not be *aware*, almost in their absolute majority, that they are carrying out a deleterious and revolutionary work. On the contrary, in the naive optimism that generally characterizes them, they must feel that they are outposts of the Church that, working in the field of the Revolution, are snatching from the latter its best and most skilled conquests.

A matter of *looks*; dangerous and disastrous, no doubt. The Lord already said that wolves disguise themselves in sheep's clothing and St. Paul warns us against the devil who transfigures himself into an angel of light; and the Revolution, in all its forms, particularly in the most violent ones such as atheistic communism "*contains within itself an idea of false redemption, a pseudo ideal of justice, equality, fraternity*"⁵⁵⁵ . Maritain was far from this misleading and murky position when he wrote *Antimoderne*, *Trois Reformateurs* and *Primauté du Spirituel*. Then, when he had not yet begun the flirtations with Lamennais that appear in *Réligion et Culture*, he was able to refute, in advance, his most cherished theories of the

⁵⁵⁴ L. XV, 7

⁵⁵⁵ Pío X I , *Divini Redemptoris*.

Humanisme Intégral with his study on Rousseau, when he writes: "Christ cannot be separated from his Church. Christianity is alive only in the Church, outside of it it dies, and like any corpse, it enters into deliquescence. If the world does not live from living Christianity in the Church, it dies from corrupted Christianity outside the Church. It can in no way avoid it and get rid of it. The more the human race denies its King, the harder it endures it".

Precisely, in his new Christianity, Maritain begins by justifying the Revolution made in the name of "Christianity". What Christianity? "It is not -It is not about Christianity as a religious creed and the way to eternal life that the question is raised here, but about Christianity as the leaven of social and political life and as the bearer of man's temporal hope; it is not about Christianity as the treasure of divine truth maintained and propagated by the Church, it is about Christianity as historical energy at work in the world. It is not on the heights of theology, but in the depths of profane consciousness and profane existence that Christianity acts in this way, sometimes taking heretical forms or even forms of revolts in which it seems to deny itself as if the broken pieces of the key to paradise, falling on our life of misery and allying themselves with the metals of the earth, succeeded, better than the pure essence of the celestial metal, in activating the history of this world"⁵⁵⁶ .

Then there exists, by Maritain's explicit confession, a "Christianity" ferment of social and political life, bearer of temporal hope, historical energy, acting in the depths of the profane conscience; "Christianity" *different* from Christianity as religious creed, from Christianity as treasure of the divine truth, maintained and propagated by the Church, Christianity that takes heretical and revolutionary forms. For this reason Maritain writes: "It was not given to believers entirely faithful to Catholic dogma, but to the rationalists, to proclaim in France the rights of man and citizen; to the Puritans in America to give the last blow to slavery; to the atheist communists to abolish in Russia the absolutism of private profit"⁵⁵⁷ . Con this he explicitly points out that the "Christian" work of the French Revolution and of the communist revolution has been

⁵⁵⁶ *Christ. et Dém.*, p. 43; English ed., p. 48.

⁵⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 44; English ed., p. 48.

The fact that it was carried out by rationalists and communists, but that this does not deprive it of its "Christian" character. On the contrary, he insinuates that it is a "grace", a "gift" (*it was not given, he says*) not granted by Providence to believers entirely faithful to Catholic dogma.

This "profane" "Christianity" identified with the revolutionary work of the "rationalists" and "communists" comes however - says⁵⁵⁸ - "from currents opened up in the world by the preaching of the Gospel, such as the effort to abolish serfdom and the effort to have the rights of the human person recognized".

Maritain takes up the thesis of Rousseau, of Abbé Fauchet, of Saint Simon, of Buchez, of Lamennais and of all Catholic liberalism, up to Marc Sangnier, who wrote⁵⁵⁹ : "We have seen Liberty, Equality, Fraternity being born from the Gospel, as a sort of political translation, we have faith that democracy will be its social translation". "When at the end of the 18th century - writes Maritain⁵⁶⁰ - the Rights of Man were proclaimed in America and in France and the peoples were invited to the ideal of Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, a great provocation of the people took place.... And, through these illusions, *a sacred truth* became sensitive to hearts; that it is necessary that the energies of the Gospel pass into the temporal life of men...; that the good news announced to open heaven and eternal life, demands, also, to transform the life of earthly societies in the very heart of their miseries and their contradictions; that, in *the Gospel message, there are political and social implications* that at all costs must be deployed in history"⁵⁶¹ .

This "Christianity" of Jacques Maritain, "profane", "political and social", "democratic", "revolutionary", which urges "the poor and the oppressed to undertake their departure towards the city of justice and fraternity"⁵⁶² instead of "building on earth a fortress for God, as the Middle Ages dealt with the Holy Empire"⁵⁶³ , is "the social-temporal refraction of truths

⁵⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁵⁹ *Le Sillon*, March 25, 1905.

⁵⁶⁰ *Christ. et Dém.* p. 49; English ed. p. 53.

⁵⁶¹ Ibid.

⁵⁶² Ibid.

⁵⁶³ Ibid.

evangelical"⁵⁶⁴ ; the "holiness and sanctification of profane life"⁵⁶⁵ ; the "*profane-Christian* and not *sacral-Christian* conception of the temporal"⁵⁶⁶ ; "the *holy freedom* of the creature which grace unites to God"⁵⁶⁷ . "the Christian impregnation of the intrinsically ethical Christian city"⁵⁶⁸ ; "the Christianity that vivifies and intrinsically impregnates and constitutes the Christian city"⁵⁶⁹ ; the "vitally Christian society"⁵⁷⁰ , the *vitally Christian lay city or Christianly constituted lay State*⁵⁷¹ ; the "personalist democracy"⁵⁷² ; "the human work to be accomplished on earth by the passage of "*quelque chose de divin*", of something divine which is love, in human means and in human work itself"⁵⁷³ ; "social structures, institutions and laws that are good and inspired by the spirit of fraternal friendship"⁵⁷⁴ ; "the dignity of the human person perceived in the mystery of the Incarnation"⁵⁷⁵ ; the *convivium* of Christians and non-Christians in temporal society⁵⁷⁶ ; the "Christian-temporal historical ideal"⁵⁷⁷ ; "integral humanism"⁵⁷⁸ ; "the temporal organism transformed and reengendered according to the Christian spirit"⁵⁷⁹ ; "temporal and politically specified political formations of intrinsically Christian inspiration"⁵⁸⁰ ; "the establishment of a true and authentic Christianity, and pure of all error coming from anti-Christian ideology"⁵⁸¹ ; "the new Christianity, realizing according to a type specifically different from that of the Middle Ages the immutable demands of a Christian temporal life, which are analogical and not univocal demands"⁵⁸² ; the new Christianity

⁵⁶⁴ *Humanisme Intégral*, Aubier, 1947, Paris, pp. 217 and 247.

⁵⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 129.

⁵⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 168.

⁵⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 169.

⁵⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 173, in note.

⁵⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 181; *Les Droits*, p. 37; English ed. p. 45.

⁵⁷¹ *Hum. Int.*, p. 182.

⁵⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 206.

⁵⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 208.

⁵⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 209.

⁵⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 211.

⁵⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 211.

⁵⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 267.

⁵⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, *passim*.

⁵⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 273.

⁵⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 274.

⁵⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 213.

⁵⁸² Ibid.

built according to "the general principles of St. Thomas Aquinas and, if I may say so, his personal reaction to the conflicts of human history"⁵⁸³ .

This "Christianity" updated under the evangelical inspiration "in function of history" in "the profane conscience of the peoples", comprises the following "thoughts, aspirations and truths": that "progress" tends to "bring the structures of conscience and the structures of human life to better states and that, throughout the whole length of history, until the advent of the kingdom of God and of the land of the risen ones which is beyond history"⁵⁸⁴ ; the dignity of the human person which transcends the State⁵⁸⁵ ; the dignity of the people and of man of common humanity⁵⁸⁶ ; "the sense of natural equality among men and the relative equality which justice must create among them"⁵⁸⁷ ; that the authority of rulers is exercised by virtue of the consent of the governed⁵⁸⁸ ; the "natural aspiration of the person to liberation from want, from servitude and from the exploitation of man by man"⁵⁸⁹ ; "a march towards the conquest of liberty in conformity with the vocation of our nature"⁵⁹⁰ ; "that civic friendship cannot in fact prevail if a stronger and more universal love, fraternal love, does not pass into it, and if, becoming fraternity, it does not pass the limits of the social group to extend itself to the whole human race"⁵⁹¹ .

This "Christianity" characterizes the democratic state of mind and the democratic philosophy of man and society and coincides with Roosevelt's "four freedoms"⁵⁹² and with Roosevelt's own democracy and international order of the United Nations, in which order "the spirit of Christ will guide the hearts of men and nations"⁵⁹³ .

⁵⁸³ Ibid., p. 212.

⁵⁸⁴ *Christ. et Dém.* p. 54; English ed. p. 58.

⁵⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 57; English ed., p. 61.

⁵⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 58; English ed., p. 62.

⁵⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 62; English ed., p. 67.

⁵⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁵⁹¹ Ibid.

⁵⁹² *Les Droits*, pp. 93-93; English ed. p. 116.

⁵⁹³ *Christ. Et Dém.* p. 66-67; English ed. p. 72.

Consequently, Maritain's "Christianity" entails a *philosophy of human life, based on the enlightenment ideas of Freemasonry, in its famous sacred ternary of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, then incarnated in life by the Revolution*. Maritain, like Lamennais and all Catholic liberals, accepts these dogmas; he obviously does not accept them "in the name of atheism". On the contrary, he believes that the action of the Church is necessary for this work, in which it must influence, not directly, but *indirectly*, by supernaturally influencing the souls of selected citizens, *preclari cives*, or new religious formations or communities, then dedicated to this work of sanctification of the temporal or profane⁵⁹⁴.

In this "earthly Christianity" or "democracy", "anticipation of the land of the resurrected"⁵⁹⁵ believers and non-believers, Buddhists, Shintoists, Brahmanists, must work, because "this spiritual renewal, however irreducible division it may involve on the dogmatic and religious level, will exercise a common action and will produce common fruits by working in the thickness of the life of the world, to transform temporal existence".

Maritain's theories contain nothing that, in the most picturesque tones, was not being proclaimed in liberal and democratic Catholic circles after Lamennais, their unfortunate creator, called them into existence. Stifled in their cradle by the *Mirare Vos* of Gregory XVI, then revived by the Catholic democratic movement of 1848, they found in Mons. Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans and the Count of Montalembert, their brilliant apologists, but they were defeated by the apostolic eloquence of the new St. Hilaire, the great Cardinal Pie, Bishop of Poitiers, who in the *Synodal Instructions on the principal errors of the present time*, of the years 1857, 1858, 1862 and 1863, 1858, 1862 and 1863, aroused the great movement of the Catholic Faith which was solemnly pronounced against the errors of Catholic liberalism in the *Allocutions* of the Pontiff Pius IX, in his encyclical *Quanta Cura* promulgated together with the *Syllabus* and, finally, in the Great Vatican Council.

But since Catholic liberalism is nothing other than the attempt to conform Catholic social life to the maxims of the century, contrary to the precept

⁵⁹⁴ *Humanisme Intégral*, p. 274.

⁵⁹⁵ *Christ. et Dém.* p. 54; English ed. p. 59.

of the Apostle who says: *Nolite conformari huic saeculo*, do not want to conform yourselves to this century⁵⁹⁶ being triumphant the century had to reappear. And in the Pontificate of Leo XIII, mischievously interpreting his wise political-social directives, an infinity of laymen and clerics swarmed who proposed to *save* the Holy Church with *democracy, coming out of the Gospel*; an attempt that had its typical expression in the movement of the Christian democrats of the Abbés Naudet, Lemire and Dabry and of the *Sillon* until they were driven away by the apostolic ardor of Pius X.

Maritain does nothing but resuscitate this attempt to conform the practical doctrine of the Church to the century. The novelty of his contribution lies in the undisputed authority of the philosopher, in a subtle and specious *mise en scène*, in the use of principles and formulas of the Angelic Doctor laboriously brought in, such as the famous theory of *analogy*, and above all in the use of an undulating philosophical language, full of distinctions, in a way of presenting and saying things as *in angulis*, which allows him to defend, in substance, the same *practical* positions of the enemies of Religion, without putting himself in apparently manifest contradiction with the formulas of the Church.

Maritainism embodies today, on the international level, what was in its time the liberalism of Lamennais, that of Montalembert, that of the Christian Democrats and that of the *Sillon*. The resounding triumph, achieved by the cause of Democracy, gives success to Maritainism in Catholic circles, because for the vulgar - and the vulgar includes many who believe themselves to be educated - the truth is on the side of those who "triumph" as if proposition 59, which says: "Law consists in the material fact and all the duties of men are vain words, and all human deeds have the force of law", were not condemned in the *Syllabus*. And so it does not cease to appear funny that the outcome of international events is accompanied by the spectacle offered by sociologists already in their sixties, exultant, because their democratist illusions of youth, shelved or dissimulated after the condemnation of the *Sillon*, achieve the category of victory in the current Maritainism; Catholics in their forties, dissatisfied, aspiring to a deputation or a ministry; women "theologians" who handle Scripture, the Councils, the Fathers, the Pontiffs, theologians, philosophy, hagiography with unalterable ease; "suffragette" women who claim for their political rights; all united, in

⁵⁹⁶ Rom., XII, 2.

fraternal friendship, around the "infallible" and "holy" Master, incarnation of the new "Christianity". And in a boldness so foolish that it does not allow it to be impious, they dare to twist the meaning of the Allocution of Pius XII on Democracy, as if the Roman Chair could teach today *anything other* than what it has been teaching since Peter, Gregory VII, Innocent III, Boniface VIII, Clement XII, Pius VI, Gregory XVI, Pius IX, Leo XIII, Pius X, Pius XI.

The official attitude of the Church towards the revolution

Therefore, in order to judge, from a Catholic point of view, Maritain's "new Christianity" where the Revolution resurfaces baptized, let us first study what has been the attitude of the Church towards the Revolutionary process.

We can summarize this attitude in the following proposition, which we will document in turn:

- a) *There is an essentially anti-Christian historical process aimed at destroying Christian civilization;*
- b) *Christian civilization formed by the Church and which reached its splendor in Christian Europe;*
- c) *to replace it with an anti-Christian civilization that tramples on the principles of ecclesiastical public law - the authentic Gospel and not the Masonic pseudo-gospel - and erects the principles of the New Law or Rights of Man;*
- d) *New law, which stems from the errors of naturalism, long condemned;*
- e) *anti-Christian civilization, whose milestones are the Reformation, philosophism, the French Revolution, liberalism, socialism and communism, the work of the Freemasons.*
- f) *In Christian history, the French Revolution represents a major conversion of the things that removed the foundations of Christian society.*

According to the pontifical teachings that comprise a continuous series of public documents of the High Ecclesiastical Magisterium, we expose the following:

a) *There is an essentially anti-Christian historical process aimed at destroying Christian civilization.*

The Church has liked to place this struggle in a grandiose perspective of universal history. For this reason Leo XIII in his famous encyclical *Humanum Genus* against the Freemasons writes: "The human race, after having separated itself miserably from God, creator and giver of heavenly goods, *through the envy of the devil*, became divided into two diverse and adverse factions, of which the one fights assiduously for truth and virtue, and the other for what is contrary to virtue and truth. The one is the kingdom of God on earth, that is to say, the true Church of Jesus Christ, to which whoever would be attached from the heart and as is fitting for salvation needs to serve God and his only begotten Son with all his understanding and all his will; the other is the kingdom of Satan, under whose empire and power are found all those who, following the disastrous examples of their leader and of our first fathers, refuse to obey the divine and eternal law and undertake undertakings against God and apart from God. Augustine shrewdly knew and described these two kingdoms as two cities of contrary laws and desires, understanding with subtle brevity the efficient cause of one and the other with these words: Two loves built two cities: the love of self to the point of contempt for God built the earthly city; the love of God to the point of contempt for self, the heavenly city.

After demonstrating the historical transcendence of this truly universal struggle, which is connected with the first origin of evil in Creation, the Pontiff continues:

"During all the continuation of the centuries they contend among themselves with various and multiple weapons and fights, though not always with equal impetus and ardor. *In our days, all those who favor the worst part seem to conspire at one and fight with the greatest vehemence, being guided and aided by the society which they call the Masons, widely extended and firmly constituted.* No longer concealing their intentions, they are boldly animated against the majesty of God, openly and publicly plotting the ruin of the Holy Church, and this with the purpose of entirely depriving the Christian peoples of the benefits that Jesus Christ, our Savior, won for them".

Nevertheless, the Church, with the unfailing favor of Jesus Christ who has promised her assistance until the end of time⁵⁹⁷, does not underestimate the danger of this struggle and so writes Benedict XV:

"After the first three centuries, in which the world was sprinkled with the blood of Christians, it (the Church) *was never in so much danger as it has begun to be at the end of the eighteenth century*"⁵⁹⁸.

And Leo XIII continues: "Thus in the space of a century and a half the sect of the Masons has hastened to achieve greater increases than could have been expected, and intruding by audacity and malice in all orders of the republics, *has begun to have so much power that it seems to have become almost master of the States*."

From such rapid and terrible progress there has followed in the Church, in the power of the prince and in public health *the ruin foreseen long ago by our predecessors*, and this has come to the point of great fear for the future, not certainly for the Church, whose foundations are firm enough to be undermined by human efforts, but for those very nations in which the sect of which we speak or other similar sects that are added as auxiliaries and satellites lograte great influence⁵⁹⁹. That this struggle is waged not only against the Church, but against Christian civilization, Pius X declares: *The civilization of the world is Christian civilization*; the more true and fruitful in precious fruits it is, the more it is genuinely Christian; the more it declines, to the immense harm of social welfare, the more it is subtracted from the Christian idea.... It is needless to say what kind of prosperity and well-being, of peace and concord, of respectful submission to authority and wise government would be achieved and flourish in the world if the whole *idea of Christian civilization* could be fully realized. But once the *continual warfare of flesh against spirit, of darkness against light, of Satan against God*, has been admitted, no such fortune is to be expected, at least in its fullness. For to the peaceful conquest of the Church there are continual infringements, so much the more

⁵⁹⁷ Mt., XXVIII, 20.

⁵⁹⁸ Quoted by Garrigou-Lagrange, *De Revelatione*, p. 602.

⁵⁹⁹ *Humanum Genus*.

The more human society tends to be governed by principles adverse to the Christian concept, the more painful and disastrous it becomes, to the point of totally apostatizing from God"⁶⁰⁰ .

b) *Christian civilization formed by the Church, which reached its splendor in Christian Europe.*

And Benedict XV, in his magnificent encyclical on peace⁶⁰¹ : "And so, from history we know that the ancient barbarian peoples of Europe, since the spirit of the Church penetrated into it, the many and great differences among themselves being gradually smoothed out, and their discord disappearing, united to form a homogeneous society, *and Christian Europe was born, which, guided and blessed by the Church, while retaining the variety of nations, arrived at a unity that fostered prosperity and greatness.* In this regard, St. Augustine says clearly: "This heavenly city, as it wanders through the earth, calls citizens of all nations and forms a pilgrim society with a variety of languages, not being concerned with the diversity of customs, laws and institutions by which earthly peace is achieved or sustained, without rescinding any of this or destroying it, but rather preserving and continuing it, since what is diverse in the various nations is ordered to the same end of earthly peace, provided it does not hinder the religion that teaches the worship of God, one, supreme, and true." And so the same holy Doctor speaks to the Church: *You unite citizens with citizens, nations with nations, and all men, remembering their first fathers, not only in society, but in a certain fraternity*".

And Pius XII⁶⁰² : "Certainly, when Europe was fraternizing in identical ideals received from Christian preaching, there was no lack of dissensions, upheavals, and wars that devastated it; but, perhaps, never has the discouragement of our days been more penetratingly experienced, on the possibility of settlement; being then alive that awareness of the just and the unjust, of the lawful and the unlawful, which makes agreements possible, while referring to the unleashing of passions and leaving open the way to an honest intelligence. In our days, on the contrary, dissensions do not come only from the impetus of rebellious passions, but also from a profound

⁶⁰⁰ *Il Fermo Proposito.*

⁶⁰¹ *Pacem Dei Munus.*

⁶⁰² *Summi Pontificatus.*

spiritual crisis, which has upset the healthy principles of private and public morality".

Already Leo XIII, explaining the guiding principles of the Christian city which today, as in the Middle Ages, Catholics must uphold and to which they must adjust their actions, which are not based precisely on freedom and universal fraternity, but on the concord of priesthood and empire, on Church and State, in happy agreement, writes⁶⁰³ .

"There was a time when *the philosophy of the Gospel governed the States*. Then that energy proper to Christian wisdom, that divine virtue, had permeated the laws, the institutions, the customs of the people, infiltrating all classes and relations of society; *The religion founded by Jesus Christ, firmly placed on the degree of honor and height that corresponds to it*, flourished everywhere, seconded by the degree and adhesion of the princes and by the tutelary and legitimate difference of the magistrates; *and the priesthood and the empire, in agreement with each other, happily shared in an amicable consortium of wills and interests*. Organized in this way, civil society produced goods far superior to any hope. The memory of them still survives, and will be recorded in countless historical monuments, illustrious and indelible, that no corrupting skill of the adversaries will ever be able to distort or obscure.

"If Christian Europe has tamed the barbarous nations and made them pass from force to meekness, from superstition to truth; if it has victoriously repulsed the irruptions of the Mohammedans; *if it has retained the scepter of civilization*, and has known how to be the teacher and guide of the rest of the world in order to discover and teach it everything that could redound to the benefit of human culture; if it has procured for the peoples the good of true liberty in its different forms; if, with very wise providence, it has created so numerous and heroic institutions to relieve men in their misfortunes; if it has procured for the peoples *the good of true freedom* in its different forms; if with very wise providence it has created so numerous and heroic institutions to alleviate men in their misfortunes, there is no doubt, all this it must greatly thank *religion*, which gave it to excogitate and initiate such enterprises, inspiration and encouragement, as well as effective and constant help to carry them out".

⁶⁰³ *Immortale Dei.*

c) *An anti-Christian civilization that tramples on the principles of ecclesiastical public law -the authentic Gospel and not the Masonic pseudo-gospel- and erects the principles of the new law or Law of Man.*

After Leo XIII⁶⁰⁴, in a masterly manner, expounds the great principles of the Christian city, in which *the rights of God, whose representation on earth is exercised by divine disposition, the Holy Church*, were first and publicly recognized, he goes on to expound the principles of the new Law which governs the anti-Christian moderna city and writes: "But the harmful and deplorable novelties promoted in the sixteenth century, having first upset the things of the Christian religion, by natural consequence came to upset *philosophy, and by this, the whole order of civil society*. From here, as from the source, were derived those modern principles of unbridled liberty invented in the great revolution of the last century and proposed as the basis and foundation of a *new law*, never before known, and which dissents in many of its parts not only from Christian law, but also from natural law".

The Pontiff goes on to specify what these principles are: "Supreme among such principles is that *all men are equal*; that each is *master of himself*; that they can *think freely what they want*; that no one has *the right to command others*; that there is no other source of authority than *the will of the people*; that the State is nothing more than *a multitude that is master and governor of itself*; that it does not *publicly profess any religion*; that there must be freedom of conscience, freedom of worship, freedom of thought, and freedom of the press".

d) *New law that stems from the errors of naturalism, long condemned.*

A thick volume would be necessary to contain the documents of the Roman Chair that, in an uninterrupted way, has been condemning the errors of the New Law, since Clement XII⁶⁰⁵, denounces the Freemasons and their naturalistic theories, Benedict XIV, Pius VI who, in repeated documents reproves the impiety of the French Revolution, Pius VII, Leo XII, Gregory XVI, the great Pius IX, with fifty encyclicals or allocutions.

⁶⁰⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁰⁵ *In eminenti*.

condemnatory of modern errors, then catalogued in the famous *Syllabus* of 1864, Leo XIII in his masterly encyclicals, Pius X in the *Pascendi* and in the *Sillon*, Benedict XV, Pius XI in recent documents up to Pius XII in his great encyclical *Summi Pontificatus* and in his no less valuable allocutions.

These errors, as far as public law is concerned, can be summed up in the words of Leo XIII⁶⁰⁶ against the Freemasons:

"Next come the principles of political science. In this genre the naturalists state that all men have *equal rights* and are of equal status in everything; that all are free by nature; that no one has the right to command another, and to pretend that men obey any authority that does not come from themselves is properly to do them violence. Everything, then, is *in the hands of the free people*; authority exists *by mandate or concession of the people*: so much so that, the popular will being changed, it is lawful to dethrone princes even by force. The source of all civil rights and obligations is either in the multitude or in the government of the nation, informed, of course, according to the new principles. It is convenient, moreover, that the State should be atheistic; there is no reason to *place one or the other among the various religions*, but *all are to be equally considered*.

"And that all this pleases the Masons in the same way, and that they wish to constitute nations according to this model, is something so well known that it does not need to be demonstrated. With all their forces and interests they have been scheming thus for a long time, and with this they make the way open to others more audacious who rush into worse things, such as that they procure the equality and communion of all wealth, thus erasing from the State all differences of classes and fortunes".

e) *Anti-Christian civilization, whose milestones are the Reformation, philosophism, the French Revolution, liberalism, socialism and communism.*

THE REFORM. "...the doctrines invented by the moderns..., like so many other spurs, stimulate the popular passions, which become angry and insolent, rushing down the easy slope to the blind movements and open

⁶⁰⁶ *Humanum Genus*.

seditions, threatening the very life of the States. This is proven by what happened in the times of the so-called *Reform*..."⁶⁰⁷ .

PHILOSOPHISM. "But after those who gloried in the name of *philosophers* attributed to man *a certain unbridled freedom* and began to form and sanction a *new Law*, contrary to natural and divine law"⁶⁰⁸ .

FRENCH REVOLUTION. "From here, as from source, were derived those modern principles of unbridled liberty, invented in *the great revolution of the last century*..."⁶⁰⁹ .

LIBERALISM. "There are many imitators of Lucifer, whose is that nefarious cry *no will serve*, who in the name of liberty defend an absurd license And they want to be called liberals"⁶¹⁰ .

SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM. "From that heresy was born in the last century philosophism, the so-called new right, popular sovereignty and, recently, a license, incipient and ignorant, which many call only freedom; all of which has brought these plagues, which are called *communism, socialism and nihilism*, tremendous monsters of civil society, whose funerals seem. And yet many strive to extend and dilate the rule of so many evils, and under color of favoring the interests of the multitudes, they promoted not a few fires of calamities"⁶¹¹ .

We could be content with this for our purposes. But it is necessary, at this moment when the struggle reaches its climax and when impiety, almost absolute master of all universal power, is about to enthrone the universal antichristian city, prepared since the days of Cain, to be aware of this dramatic moment of expectation among the air powers, of which the apostle⁶¹² speaks, lest this hour of darkness be interpreted by some as one of Christian splendor.

⁶⁰⁷ *Diuturnum*.

⁶⁰⁸ *Quod Apostolici Muneris*.

⁶⁰⁹ *Immortale Dei*.

⁶¹⁰ *Libertas*.

⁶¹¹ *Diuturnum*.

⁶¹² Ephesians, II, 2.

Today the struggle has as its immediate objective the domination of the temporal city, to bring it under the power of the Antichrist. It is a struggle for the antichristian disorder that today has its maximum concrete expression in Communism and in those movements that lead to it, such as liberalism and socialism. This is a truth that cannot be ignored after Pius XI has made it clear in the encyclicals *Caritate Christi* of May 3, 1932 and *Divini Redemptoris* of March 19, 1937. The Pope's teaching is famous: "See to it," he says, "Venerable Brethren, that the faithful do not allow themselves to be deceived. *Communism is intrinsically perverse, and those who wish to save Christian civilization cannot be allowed to collaborate with it in any field*". And as someone, using subtle distinctions, could dissociate the communist idea from the Bolshevik state, the Pope is careful to identify them and thus speaks in repeated passages of Soviet or Bolshevik or Muscovite communism. That is to say that, in concrete terms, the struggle today is between Christian civilization, the kingdom of the Church; and Bolshevik atheistic communism, with its head, for the time being, in Russia, the kingdom of Antichrist. For this reason Pius XI applies to communism, which he calls *the most tremendous evil of our times* (*Caritate Christi*), the characteristics proper to Antichrist. Thus he says in *Caritate Christi*: *...that satanic hatred against religion, which recalls the mysterium iniquitatis of which St. Paul speaks to us*⁶¹³ ; and in *Divini Redemptoris* he writes: "And this is what we are unfortunately seeing: *for the first time in history*, we are witnessing a coldly calculated and carefully prepared struggle '*against all that is divine*'," alluding to the passage in the Second Letter of St. Paul to the faithful of Thessalonica where the apostle refers to the Antichrist in these terms: '*Let no man deceive you by any means: for except the apostasy come first, and the son of perdition be first revealed, he that warreth against all that is divine...*'.

The kinship of communism with liberalism is pointed out by the Pontiff in the same letter when he writes: "And to explain how communism has succeeded in getting the working masses to accept it without examination, it is worth remembering that they were already prepared for it by the religious and moral abandonment in which the liberal economy had left them...". Now, then, *we are reaping the fruits of errors so often denounced by our predecessors and by ourselves, and we should not be surprised that in a world so deeply de-Christianized, the communist error overflows*.

⁶¹³ II Thess., II, 7.

These authoritative considerations, which could be more documentary and precise if the narrowness of this study would allow it, show us that there is *a continuity* in the action of those who throughout the centuries fight against Christian civilization. This is already enough to think that there is a common center of activity that directs this struggle. The Roman Chair has not failed to denounce it with all clarity. Thus Pius XI says⁶¹⁴ : "Moreover, this very rapid spread of communist ideas, which infiltrate all countries, large and small, educated and less developed, so that no corner of the earth is free from them, *is explained by a truly diabolical propaganda, such as the world has perhaps never known: propaganda directed from a single center and skillfully adapted to the conditions of the various peoples*". It is this center that has subjected Russia to the Communist yoke, as the Pontiff declares: "But in no way do we wish to condemn en masse the peoples of the Soviet Union, for whom we feel the most lively paternal affection. We know that not a few of them groan under the *harsh yoke imposed by force by men for the most part alien to the true interests of the country*, and we recognize that many others have been deceived by false hopes. We condemn the system and *its authors and perpetrators, who have considered Russia as the most suitable ground for putting into practice a system worked out decades ago, and from there continue to propagate it throughout the world*"⁶¹⁵ .

Hence it would be a grave error to consider Bolshevik communism as an erroneous and dangerous system - one of many - detached from others; ...it is the more serious and fundamental danger because it is the system excogitated to be opposed to Christian civilization, by those who control and direct the secular struggle against the Church and Christian civilization. Hence Pius XI himself in his *Divini Redemptoris* takes special care to link Bolshevik communism with the communism that appeared in 1846 and even with the other de-Christianizing forces. Pius XI says: "From the time when certain occult circles *sought to liberate human civilization from the chains of morality and religion*, Our Predecessors have openly and explicitly called the attention of the world to the consequences of the de-Christianization of human society. And as far as communism is concerned, as early as 1846, our

⁶¹⁴ *Divini Redemptoris*.

⁶¹⁵ *Ibid.*

Predecessor Pius IX, of saintly memory, pronounced a solemn condemnation, later confirmed in the *Syllabus*, against *"the nefarious doctrine of so-called communism, so contrary to natural law itself; which, once admitted, would lead to the radical subversion of the rights, goods and property of all, and even of human society itself"*. Later, another Predecessor of immortal memory, Leo XIII, in his encyclical *Quod Apostolici Muneris*, defined it as *"a deadly pestilence that infiltrates the most intimate joints of human society and puts it in danger of death"*; and with clear vision he indicated that the atheistic currents among the popular masses in the age of technicism, *brought their origin from that philosophy, which centuries ago tried to separate science and life from faith and the Church"*.

It follows then that, according to the teachings of the Magisterium of the Church, atheistic Muscovite communism, enemy number one of Christian civilization, is linked to the communism that made its entry into history in 1846 with the revolutionary attempts of that time and with the scientific justification sought by Marx and Engels. It is also linked to liberalism and philosophism, which have been at work since the early years of the eighteenth century, in this work of destruction of Christian civilization. And here one wonders: can this systematically continued campaign against the Church and Christian civilization, through the centuries, be explained if there is not one and the same brain that excogitates and one and the same hand that executes? To unveil this mystery to us, Leo XIII wrote *Humanum Genus*, where he tells us: *"During the continuation of the centuries they contend among themselves with various and multiple weapons and fights, although not always with equal impetus and ardor. In our days, all those who favor the worst part seem to conspire at one and fight with the greatest vehemence, being their guide and aid the society which they call the Masons, widely spread and firmly constituted"*.

And lest anyone should imagine that the Pontiff is referring to momentary enemies of the Church and not to continuous enemies who have been at work for centuries and in the most diverse situations and places, Leo XIII invokes the Documents of his Predecessors saying: *"The Roman Pontiffs our predecessors, watching solicitously for the salvation of the Christian people, knew very soon who this capital enemy was and what he wanted as soon as he appeared in the darkness of his hidden conspiracy; and since he had not been able to find a way out of the darkness of his hidden conspiracy, they were not able to find*

out who he was and what he wanted.

declaring their holy name and sign, they warned with foresight princes and peoples not to allow themselves to be caught in the evil arts or tricks prepared to deceive them. *The first warning of the danger* was given in 1738 by Pope Clement XII, whose constitution was signed and renewed by Benedict XIV. Pius VII followed in the footsteps of both, and Leo XII, including in the Apostolic Constitution *Quo Graviora* what had been decreed in this matter by his predecessors, ratified and confirmed it forever. Pius VIII, Gregory XVI and Pius IX, by the way, repeatedly spoke in the same sense". The Pontiff then emphasizes the power that this sect has attained, "meddling by audacity and malice in all orders of the republic to the point that it seems to have made itself almost master of the States," and then explains how it is aided in its work by other societies. "There are various sects which, although different in name, rites, forms and origin, united among themselves by a certain communion of purpose and affinity among their capital opinions, agree in fact with the Masonic sect, a sort of center from which all depart and to which they return. These, although they appear not to want in any way to hide themselves in the darkness, and have their meetings in view of all and publish their newspapers, yet, well looked at, they are a kind of secret societies, whose uses they preserve.... With these false appearances and constant art of pretense, the Masons try with all their might, as the Manichaeans once did, to hide themselves and have no other witnesses than their own. They seek skilfully subterfuges, taking the mask of scholars and learned men who meet for scientific purposes; they continually speak of their commitment to civilization, of their love for the lowest plebs; that their only desire is to improve the condition of the people and to communicate to as many as possible the advantages of civil society".

Beneath these humanitarian and fraternal titles are hidden the malevolent attempts, as Leo XIII says, to "put an end to religion and the Church perennially preserved by God Himself, and to resurrect after eighteen centuries the customs and doctrines of the Gentile". These occult forces are also denounced by Pius XI in important documents, as promoters of the destruction of Christian civilization. Speaking of communism in *Divini Redemptoris* and examining the causes of its spread, he adds: "A third and powerful aid to the spread of communism is that *veritable conspiracy of silence* exercised by a part of the non-Catholic world press. We say conspiracy, because it cannot be otherwise explained that a press so eager to highlight even the

smallest incidents of communism should be so eager to spread it.

The fact is that the Church has been able to remain silent for so long about the horrors committed in Russia, in Mexico and also in a large part of Spain, and to speak relatively little about such a vast world organization as Moscow communism. *This silence is partly due to reasons of a less far-sighted policy and is supported by various occult forces which, for some time now, have been trying to destroy the Christian social order*".

In the light of these teachings of the high ecclesiastical Magisterium, it appears clear that there is a continuity, through the centuries, in the earthly agents of the devil who yesterday with Protestantism and philosophism and the French Revolution, then with liberalism and socialism, today with communism, work to demolish the Christian city. One could delve deeper into the investigation and inquire whether behind the Masonic sects there is not still the action of more secret agents working against Christ since He appeared on earth and was placed as a sign of contradiction⁶¹⁶. But for the purpose of our study, it is enough for us to dwell on Freemasonry and communism working together. Let us note, however, how we must frankly denounce the enemies ambushed in the very walls of the Christian city, who, under the guise of a *weak and sweet Christianity*, more compassionate with non-Catholics than with Catholics, lay the blame for the de-Christianization of life on the latter. Undoubtedly, we are all to blame for the fact that Jesus Christ is not more loved and glorified. But this systematic eagerness, introduced by Berdiaeff, and continued by Maritain, to blame Catholics for the evils of liberalism and communism, does not cease to be *suspicious*; because with this tactic, typical of the father of lies, dressed as an angel of light, a smokescreen is thrown over the real agents of social dissolution who, thus shielded, can work more rapidly in the destruction of Christianity.

No one should be surprised then that the Church has been repeating with Benedict XIV in *Providas*, Pius VII in *Ecclesiam*, Leo XII in *Quo graviora*, Pius IX in *Multiplices*, Leo XIII in *Humanum Genus*, the terrible condemnations against the Freemasons, brought by Clement XII, in *in eminenti*, of April 28, 1738: "For this reason, We seriously and by virtue of holy obedience forbid all and each one of the faithful of Jesus Christ of any state,

⁶¹⁶ See *El judío en el misterio de la historia*, Ediciones Theoria, Buenos Aires, and *El comunismo en la revolución anticristiana*, Ediciones Theoria, 1961.

degree, condition, rank, dignity and pre-eminence, whether they be lay or ecclesiastical, secular or regular, even those of whom specific and individual mention should be made, to dare or presume to enter under any pretext, or under any color, into the said societies of Freemasons, or otherwise called, or to propagate them, favor them, receive them into their houses, or give them asylum and conceal them elsewhere, to be enrolled in them or attached to them, or to attend them, or to give them power and means to assemble, to furnish them with any thing, to give them advice, favor or aid publicly or secretly, directly or indirectly, or in any manner whatsoever, or assist in them, or give them power and means to assemble, furnish them with anything, give them advice, favor, or aid publicly or secretly, directly or indirectly, by themselves or others, in any manner whatsoever, as also to exhort others, induce, provoke, or persuade them, to have themselves enrolled in such societies, become members thereof, and attend, assist, aid, or favor them, in any manner whatsoever: and We absolutely command them, that they abstain altogether from these societies, assemblies, meetings, aggregations, or conventuals under pain of excommunication for all contraveners (as aforesaid) in which they shall *ipso facto* incur, and without any other declaration, from which (outside of the article of death), only from Us, or from the Roman Pontiffs, then existing, they may receive absolution."

f) The *French Revolution represents in Christian history a great conversion of things that removed the foundations of Christian society.*

The city of God - Christian civilization - and the city of man - have coexisted during the Christian centuries like wheat and tares. But until the French Revolution *the public norm of life* among Christian peoples was imposed by the City of God. The heresies that never ceased to lie in wait against the Christian city and with great partial successes, only achieved a great universal victory in the French Revolution, when, the impious gathered together in terrible conspiracy against God and against Christ, they said; "*Let us break their bonds and cast off their yoke from us*" and resolved to destroy the ancient Christian city and replace it by another made to suit man. Impiety, then, transformed into an angel of light with the pompous name of philosophy, made "the target of its hatreds all the governments and all the institutions of Europe because they were Christian and in so far as they were Christian; a malaise of opinion and universal discontent seized all heads. In

France, above all, philosophical rage knew no bounds and soon a single formidable voice made up of so many united voices cried out to God in the midst of the guilty Europe:

Let us! Will it then be necessary to tremble eternally before the priests and to receive from them the instruction they want to give us? The truth is hidden throughout Europe by the smoke of the censer, it is time for it to come out of this fatal cloud. We will no longer speak of you to our children. It will be up to them when they are men, to know if you exist, who you are and what you want from them. Everything that exists disgusts us because your name is written on everything that exists. We want to destroy everything and remake it without you. Get out of our councils, out of our academies, out of our houses. Reason is enough for us. Leave us!"⁶¹⁷ .

The pretext for establishing the new social order was liberty, the code, the social contract; the means, demagoguery; the ultimate reason, the constitution of the atheistic and colossal State, supreme arbiter of all rights, of all that is licit and illicit, omnipotent dictator of what is permitted or prohibited under which the name and worship of God will be perpetually abolished. To this end everything is directed and all means are ordered; to this, the destruction of the family; to this, the destruction of both municipal and provincial liberties so that only the power of the impious State remains without whose empire no one can move foot or hand in the whole realm of the universe. This is the end of the attempt and not civil liberty. Liberty is a pretext, liberty is an idol to seduce the people, an idol that has hands and does not feel, has feet and does not walk, an inanimate numen under which Satan prepares to reduce the people to a servitude far worse than that in which they were held in antiquity with the material idols of paganism⁶¹⁸ . And this final result of the absolute secularization of life is not affected by the differences in the means that the so-called anti-democratic or democratic totalitarianisms can employ, because impiety nests equally in the entrails of both, and they are but two faces - Gog and Magog - of one and the same personage, the great Seducer.

The French Revolution was the first great battle, of universal projection, lost by the Church. With it, for the first time, an anti-Christian civilization was implanted in the heart of Christianity and in the world. The civilizing direction of the world is, from then on, in the hands of the Counter-Church and, from then on, an anti-Christian ideal is erected as the norm of civilizing life.

⁶¹⁷ De Maistre, *Essay on the Principle Generating Constitutions*, Oeuvres complètes, 1891, I, p. 306.

⁶¹⁸ Billot, *De Ecclesia Christi*, II, p. 36.

Before 1789, there were many errors of intelligence and great corruption of morals, but the social values erected as norms of life were Catholic and so were the institutions. On the contrary, since then, anti-Christian norms have been publicly erected as ideals, and if truth and goodness continue to persevere through the influence of the Church, they can only reach a restricted projection that hardly goes beyond the individual sphere.

Hence the Church's very severe judgment of the French Revolution. Benedict XV judged it thus, on March 7, 1917: "After those first three centuries in which the world was sprinkled with the blood of Christians, never was the Church in so much danger as she has begun to be at the end of the eighteenth century. For the people's minds were infatuated by the foolish philosophy that originated in the heresy and rebellion of the Novatians, and *this great conversion of things* began to shake *the foundations of Christian society*, not only in France, but little by little in all nations. For when *the authority of the Church* was *publicly* rejected, when *Religion* ceased to be regarded as the guardian and vindicator of right, duty and order in the city, it became necessary to derive all authority from the people, as from God; that all men are equal by nature as well as by right; That it was lawful whatever each one pleased, provided the law did not forbid it; that nothing had the force of law but what the multitude commanded; that the liberties especially of giving opinions concerning religion, or of divulging what one pleased, were not bound by any limitation so long as it did not harm another. These are as it were the principles on which, since then, the order of cities has been founded. But how pernicious they are to human society was never so clearly shown as when they were declared, when, with them, blind passions and party divisions armed the multitude".

Pius VI⁶¹⁹ had already denounced that what the National Assembly intended "by means of its Constitution, was to annihilate the Catholic Religion and with it the obedience due to Kings. To this end it is established that man placed in society must enjoy absolute freedom, which not only gives him the right never to be disturbed by his religious opinions, but also grants him the faculty to think, to say, to write, and even to have printed with impunity in matters of religion everything that may suggest an imagination....

⁶¹⁹ Brief to Cardinal de la Rochefoucault, 10-III-1791.

the most misguided: monstrous right, which nevertheless seems to the Assembly to result from the equality and natural freedom of man.... But to dispel in the eyes of sound reason this phantom of unlimited liberty, it will suffice to say that this was the system of the Waldenses and of the Beguards condemned by Clement V with the approval of the Ecumenical Council of Vienna; a system later followed by the Vincentians and finally by Luther, as is evident from his words: *We are free from every kind of yoke*". And in the Brief of April 23, 1791, the same Pontiff condemns the famous Rights of Man with that lapidary sentence: "*Jura illa religioni et societati adversantia*". Those rights contrary to religion and society".

After considering these grave testimonies of the Magisterium of the Church, which alone should regulate the private and public, individual and social conduct of Catholics, it may be asked, how is it possible that Catholics, and some of them in whom it is logical to suppose knowledge of this invariable position of the Holy Church, who have defended it in books still circulating as *Antimoderne and Théonas*, how is it possible that they defend today *another position*, escorting the Revolution? The Vatican Council gives an answer to this question when in its Constitution *Unigenitus Dei Filius*, it says: "By the fact of this impiety which has spread everywhere, it has unfortunately happened that even many children of the Catholic Church have strayed from the path of true piety and the Catholic sense has been diminished in them with a gradual diminution of the truths. For dragged along by various and pilgrim doctrines, making a bad mixture of nature and grace, of human science and divine faith, it turns out as the facts show, that they have depraved the genuine sense of the dogmas and endanger the integrity and sincerity of the faith."

CONCLUSION

*Perverseely confusing nature and grace
(Vatican Council, Constitution
"Unigenitus").*

From the constant teaching of the highest Magisterium perpetuated in *explicit* documents during the last two centuries, it is clear that the city of the Revolution is the work of Freemasonry, which organizes and directs, in modern times, the secular struggle initiated on Calvary against Christ and His Church; a struggle which, hypocritically invoking the "Christian" ideal of the Gospel, wants to translate on the social-political plane, without the Church, the program proper to the Church which must be verified on the supernatural plane in order to vivify the temporal one from there. To give an idea of the nature and magnitude of this struggle, let us consider the four eminently Christian ideas of liberty, equality, fraternity and progress on which the Revolution is nourished.

FREEDOM. St. Paul preaching to the Galatians tells them: "*For you, brethren, are called to a state of freedom*"⁶²⁰. What is this state of freedom that the Apostle preaches? St. Thomas teaches that "this state of freedom to which the Apostle induces is the state of the Christian faith, which is freedom itself, from which the Jews wanted to withdraw the converts to return them to the servitude of the Jewish rites. "*For you have not received,*" the Apostle himself tells them⁶²¹, "*the spirit of bondage, that you should still work through fear as a slave, but you have received the spirit of adoption as sons, by virtue of which we cry out with all confidence, Abba, this is, O my Father*"⁶²².

Did this word, in the mouth of the Apostle, have a political significance, calling the slaves or the people to *emancipation*? Not at all.

⁶²⁰ V, 13.

⁶²¹ Rom., VIII, 15.

⁶²² In omnes S. Pauli Epistolas commentaria.

For this reason the Apostle himself, in a *letter to his disciple Bishop Titus*⁶²³, tells him: "*exhort the servants to be obedient to their masters, giving them pleasure in everything, not being responsible, not displeasing them in anything, but showing in all things perfect loyalty; so that their conduct may make the doctrine of God, our Savior, respected in the whole world*". The spiritual meaning of the Apostle's preaching shines forth in that famous text of the *Second Letter to the Corinthians*⁶²⁴, where he writes: "*For the Lord is Spirit; and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty*".

So the Apostle's teaching has no social-political influence? Directly none. *Indirectly* much and great, inasmuch as in exhorting all, free and slave, rulers and subjects, to the fulfillment of all natural law and the practice of supernatural charity, he tended to eliminate injustices, to consolidate the rights and legitimate natural and historical differences existing among men and above them, to tighten the bonds of union in charity for the love of God. *The word "freedom", properly interpreted, encompasses the whole of Christian civilization.*

EQUALITY. In his *Letter to the Galatians*⁶²⁵, St. Paul teaches: "*There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female. For you are all one in Jesus Christ*". St. Thomas, commenting on this passage of the Apostle, writes: "For there is nothing in men that can except them from receiving the faith of Christ and baptism. And he establishes three differences of men, showing that by them no one is excepted from the faith of Christ. Difference as to rite, *there is neither Jew nor Greek*; difference as to state and condition, *there is neither bond nor free*; difference as to nature, *there is neither male nor female*."

Does it follow from these words of the Apostle that the differences of *natural* or *historical law*, between Jew and Greek, between servant and free, between man and woman, must disappear? Not at all. And for this reason the Apostle reminds husbands and wives⁶²⁶, children and parents⁶²⁷, servants and masters⁶²⁸ of their respective duties.

⁶²³ II, 9.

⁶²⁴ III, 17.

⁶²⁵ III, 28.

⁶²⁶ Ephesians, V, 22-23.

⁶²⁷ VI, 1-4.

⁶²⁸ Ibid., 5-9.

But by establishing this equality on the supernatural plane of the Church between Greeks and Jews, free and slaves, men and women, *indirectly*, and as, *in addition*, benefits descend on the natural plane, not certainly the elimination of necessary and convenient differences (which would be ruin and not health) but the suppression of injustices and the consolidation of beneficial natural and historical differences - for this reason the Church kept the Roman juridical order and Greek science - and, above these differences, the supernatural union of intelligences and hearts.

Christians then, one Jew and one Gentile, one free and one servant, one man and one woman, differentiated by *natural* characters, without breaking or diminishing these differences, that is, without ceasing to be Jew the one and Greek the other, free the one and servant the other, man the one and woman the other, must give all the first and fundamental importance to the supernatural truth that they are Christians and love each other as *one thing in Christ*, each fulfilling the duties of his own condition and state. The natural order then, far from being corrupted by the supernatural truth, is consolidated and the supernatural truth by maintaining primacy over the natural, creates a higher and more excellent union between men who embrace and love each other in Jesus Christ. Let us note well that in this way nature and grace are not "perversely confused". The rights of each order are affirmed in their own orbit, perfectly distinguished, without separation, and at the same time intrinsically subordinated, as the natural is subordinated to the supernatural. *Christian "equality," properly interpreted, is the whole of Christian civilization.*

FR ATER NITY. St. Paul⁶²⁹ writes: "*Have a horror of evil, and apply yourselves to good, loving one another with tenderness and brotherly charity, seeking to anticipate one another in signs of honor and deference*". St. Thomas comments on this passage: "Let us not only love the brethren out of charity, but the same charity by which we love them and are loved by them. For if we love the same charity we will not easily dissolve it, so that the *Charity of the fraternity* may remain in you"⁶³⁰. This fraternity of Christians must be translated on the supernatural level by love for one another, by a kind of *equalization* of supernatural goods, affections, prayers, in Christ and for Christ. Has this fraternity of Christians been translated on the supernatural level by love for one another, by a kind of *equalization* of supernatural goods, affections, prayers, in Christ and through Christ.

⁶²⁹ Rom. XII, 10.

⁶³⁰ In omnes S. Pauli commentaria.

also be translated at the social-political level by an equalization of *civic* goods. Of economic goods - all citizens equal -, of economic goods - all men equally owned or equally deprived of property - by a universal suppression of frontiers, social differences, sexes and status? Not at all. For if it were so, the *order of grace* would destroy the *order of nature*, which is against all ecclesiastical teaching, summed up in the famous theological axiom that "grace does not destroy nature." But it is clear that the love of our brothers in God must move us to help them in their spiritual and temporal needs, according to the words of St. John: "Whoever has the goods of this world and sees his brother in need and closes his heart, how can the love of God dwell in him?"

The Christian "fraternity" is, then, nothing more than supernatural charity - which has as its formal object the supernatural love of God - and in a movement towards God that does not suppress differences and natural hierarchies but on the contrary, because the things of God *ordinatae sunt*, are ordained⁶³¹, elevates and unites souls on the supernatural plane. *The Christian "fraternity" properly interpreted contains the whole of Christian civilization.*

PROGRESS. In the *Letter to the Galatians*⁶³² the Apostle Paul teaches: "So we, when we were still children, were servants... under the authority of tutors and guardians.... And so none of you is a servant any longer, but a son". The Apostle teaches that the Jewish people received the commands of the law in fear of punishment and in hope of temporal goods; but with the coming of Christ we have been called to a state of spiritual maturity in which the law of fear does not prevail, but the commandment of love. And the Apostle also teaches in his *Letter to the Ephesians* that Jesus Christ ascended into heaven "to fulfill all things, and that he himself has appointed some as apostles, and some as prophets, and some as evangelists, and some as pastors and teachers, to work for the perfection of the saints in the functions of their ministry, in the building up of the mystical body of Christ, until we all come to the unity of one faith and one knowledge of the Son of God, to the state of a perfect man according to the measure of the perfect age according to which Christ is to be formed mystically in us"⁶³³. Here the Apostle speaks of the

⁶³¹ Rom., XIII, 1.

⁶³² IV, 1-7.

⁶³³ IV, 10-13.

perfection to be attained by the Mystical Body of Christ, that is, the Church, in conformity with the fullness of the age of the Mystical Body⁶³⁴.

Does this idea of "progress" have a social-political sense as Lamennais intended, applicable to Christian peoples who from infancy enter maturity? *Directly*, none. But *indirectly*, very much so. For if peoples submit themselves to the supernatural grace of the Holy Church, they *progress* in their truly human life, which is the interior life, and in progressing there, they consequently raise towards God all the other parts and manifestations of life, organically connected among themselves in a most perfect unity, which brings about an authentic progress in knowledge and in cultural, political and economic procedure. And thus are fulfilled those words of Leo XIII⁶³⁵ : "The immortal work of the merciful God is his Church; which, although of herself and by her own nature she is concerned for the salvation of souls and their happiness in heaven, yet even within the domain of things that are outdated and earthly she procures so many and such great goods, that neither more in number nor better in quality would result if the first and principal object of her institution were to ensure the prosperity of this present life. In truth, wherever the Church set foot, she changed the state of things; she informed the customs with virtues previously unknown and implanted in the civil society a new culture, that the people who received her, she advanced and exalted above the others by the gentleness, equity and the glory of the enterprises".

Direct translation of these ideas to the natural plane

What would happen if someone were to apply directly to the natural plane - to earthly life, to the social-political - these supernatural truths of liberty, equality, fraternity and progress, preached by the Apostle St. Paul?

Freedom which, in itself, means independence and emancipation, would tone the conscience of each individual man, would make him aware of his own dignity and independence -*prise de conscience*- of *new* rights related to this *new prise de conscience*, and, consequently, would break all subjection of

⁶³⁴ St. Thomas, *ibid.*

⁶³⁵In *Immortale Dei*.

man to another man as unworthy and contrary to the dignity of the human person. And if each individual man did not adopt a position of *absolute* independence from every being other than himself, as the Kantian arrogance that has pervaded modern thought and life pretends, he would at least adopt a *relative* independence from *public authority* that would only be recognized and tolerated insofar as it *emanated from himself* and was *consented to* by himself. In this second point lies the doctrine of Lamennais, Marc Sangnier and Maritain. And against their falsehood, which affects strictly dogmatic principles, the encyclical *Quod Apostolici muneris* of Leo XIII is especially directed, where we are reminded: "Surely the Church constantly inculcates in the multitude of her subjects this precept of the Apostle: There is no power except from God, and those that are, are ordained of God; so that he who resists the power, resists the ordination of God: but those who resist, bring condemnation upon themselves. For elsewhere he commands us to be subject of necessity, not only by force, but also by conscience; and to pay to all what is due: to whom tribute, tribute; to whom tribute, tribute; to whom fear, fear; to whom honor, honor (*Rom. 13:1-7*). For indeed, he who created and governs all things, in his provident wisdom, has ordained that the lesser things should come by the mean, and the mean by the higher, to their respective ends" (*Rom. 13:1-7*). *The word "freedom", viciously interpreted, contains the whole anti-Christian civilization.*

Equality, which in itself excludes differences and inequalities, taken *directly* to the social-political plane, would eliminate *the distinction of nationalities*, there is no distinction of Jew or Greek, *the distinction of social classes*, there is no distinction of free and servant, *the distinction of sexes*, there is no distinction of man and woman. And in an absolute and universal destruction of servitudes, differences and hierarchies, all men, without distinction of nationality, status, condition and sex, would have the same rights and freedoms, personal, economic and political. The universe would become an immense emporium, where suppressed the differences of cultures, races, national traditions - lived not folkloric -, differences of social classes as permanent values responding to diverse essential functions, knowledge, power, money, and work, it would be a single universal city, with a single universal religion, a single universal homeland, a single universal condition - that of *worker* -, a single universal aspiration, that of spending as happily and pleasantly as possible the days of our inevitable

passage through the earth. Such is the city dreamed by Lamennais, Marc Sangnier and Maritain.

But this *egalitarian city* would be the radical negation that the *good of hunger* is constituted not by a *homogeneous* good, work or pleasure or money, but by a heterogeneous good, work-money *at the service* of virtue -the political- and the political at the service of knowledge -culture- and the economic-political-culture at the service of divine contemplation: Religion. This *egalitarian city* would fundamentally oppose Catholic dogmatic principles. On the one hand to those that teach the supremacy of divine right of the Holy Religion, which must be sought in all things first and foremost, according to those words of the Lord: *seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness*⁶³⁶ ; so that *institutions* and *persons* embodying these values cannot be *equated with* the rest of the city. It would also oppose the principles that teach the supremacy that culture must exercise over power and power over economic relations; therefore, an *egalitarian city* could not be put into practice except at the very grave detriment of each and every one of the human persons who compose it, who, although enjoying all the *theoretical* rights to the perfection of religious life, of cultural life, of political life and of economic life, in concrete reality, and as a consequence of this, would have the right, in the concrete reality and as a consequence of this, to the same rights as those of the rest of the city, of the rest of the city, in concrete reality and as a consequence of having sacrificed themselves to egalitarianism, the organs and vehicles proper to these diverse perfections, would be nothing but *homogeneous particles*, without religion, without culture, without virtue, *mechanical portions* of a monstrous and formless social gear. Such a city would be radically opposed to what Leo XIII⁶³⁷ teaches: "Therefore, just as the kingdom of heaven itself willed that the choirs of angels should be distinct and one subject to another, so also in the Church it instituted various degrees of orders and diversities of offices, so that not all should be apostles, not all doctors, not all pastors (I Cor. 12, 27), so also he determined that in civil society there should be several orders, diverse in dignity, rights and power; namely, that the citizens, as well as the Church, should be one body, composed of many members, *some nobler than others*, but all necessary to each other and solicitous of the common good". *Equality*", *viciously interpreted, contains the whole anti-Christian civilization*.

⁶³⁶ Mt., VI, 33.

⁶³⁷ *Quod Apostolici muneris.*

The "fraternity" that, in itself, says love among men for the fact of being men, taken directly to the social-political plane, means the communion and dedication of one man to another, without taking into account any gender preference. Closeness, agreement, companionship of men with men, without taking into account religious differences, or local, regional, national, cultural, racial, social differences, derived from political or economic differences. In this conception, in which Lamennais, Marc Sangnier and Maritain coincide, the universe would be an immense and grandiose city, where men above their dogmatic diversity in the religious, and above the inextinguishable individual differences, would be fraternally close in a communion in *Humanity*.

This conception of fraternity is fundamentally opposed to dogmatic principles of the Church. The Church accepts and preaches the *unity of the human race*, but as a value to be conditioned to another principle of unity that Christ brought to the world, when he said: "*But I pray not only for these, but also for those who will believe in me through their preaching; I pray... that they may all be one, even as we are one. I am in them, and thou art ever in me, that they may be consummated in unity, and conomize the world which thou hast sent me, and love them, even as thou hast loved me*"⁶³⁸. People are to be loved to the extent that they lead us to God, to Christ and to his Church, and if they are loved by us, they will be truly loved to the extent that we bring them closer to God who is Charity. Love, in order to be authentic, not utopian or disastrous humanitarianism, must be ordered by *intrinsic reference to the God of supernatural Charity*. The supreme value, as an institution to which everything must refer, is not Humanity, but the Church. And since where there is a supreme value, the principle of reference, everything is hierarchized according to it, the right order demands that human persons, affirmed in their inalienable rights⁶³⁹, subordinate themselves to the superior good of the nation, and nations, affirmed in their inalienable natural and historical rights, subordinate themselves to the good of the international community, and each and every one, human persons, nations, and international community, subordinate themselves to the Holy Church, which is the supernatural society of men and angels in communion with God. *The "fraternity", viciously interpreted, encloses the whole anti-Christian civilization.*

⁶³⁸ John, XVII, 20-26.

⁶³⁹ Allocution of Pius XII at Christmas 1942.

The idea of *progress*, which, in itself, says increase, taken to the social-political plane, will measure this ascent by the increase of liberty, equality and fraternity. And that sublime teaching of the Apostle that the child when he is a child lives under the servile fear of the law and that when he ceases to be a child and enters into maturity, he also enters into the law of love, in whose domain fear disappears, taken directly to the social-political plane, will claim *social-political rights*, of coming of age, that is, of autonomy and independence, which do not correspond to a *state of authentic perfection operated in public customs*, but to a state of arrogance and rebellion that claims pretended rights without moral conditions to exercise them. Lamennais, Marc Sangnier and Maritain also agree on this. Consequently, in the name of the "Christianity" of the purest Gospel, the universal society of men would become a fraternal city whose progress would be measured by this acquisition of independence of each man to carve his own destiny at his own risk, without any authority, at least human, interfering with this progressive and ascending movement of Humanity.

On the other hand, by destroying all the differences introduced by natural law, husband and wife, rulers and subjects, parents and children, masters and servants, or by *historical-natural* law, nationality, race, culture, etc., as a society without differences and hierarchies *is absolutely not possible*, this process of elimination of historical-natural hierarchies and differences would create others, anti-natural and anti-historical. The new universal city would have differences and hierarchies *essentially different* from the Christian society. And if in the traditional Christian city the priest was at the top of the city and then came the ruler, then the bourgeois and finally the artisan-farmer, in the new city, above all would be "the worker", the Fourth Estate.

And if in the Christian city the unity of the city was maintained because, over and above the natural-historical differences and hierarchies of the natural plane, men communicated with one another, within their respective professions, classes, nations, cultures and races, in the supernatural community of the Church; that is, they were *liberated, equalized, fraternized and progressed* in Christ, by an *upward* movement, oriented toward the supernatural order and suspended from it, by a first and foremost exchange of supernatural goods; in the new fraternal city, on the other hand, liberation, equalization, fraternization and

progress of men in a *downward* movement, in a communication of natural goods. But on what point will he place this common participation? In a common *virtue* or *science*? Impossible. For not all men, with their natural forces alone, can attain the same virtue and the same science. Therefore, it must be placed in the lowest part of man, in a tendency toward a common participation in *material goods*. Well, this and nothing else is materialistic communism. This and nothing else is the end of the liberalism of Rousseau, of the collectivism of Marx, of the Calvinism of the *Pilgrim Fathers*, of the society of Freemasonry and of the Revolution. This and nothing else is the "new Christianity" of Maritain.

From medieval Christianity to the new Christianity

To understand how the passage from Christian society to the *new* universal society takes place, let us consider the point of departure, the point of arrival, the intermediate process and the instrument that brings about the transformation.

THE STARTING POINT. The starting point is the society based on the essential values of any society, perfectly differentiated and hierarchically subordinated: the authority of the Church, the political power, the economic classes. The famous four states of the *ancien régime*. Clergy, nobility, bourgeoisie and craftsmen. Four essentially diverse states among themselves because they respond to four essentially diverse functions, the truth and supernatural grace of the Church, the virtue and culture of the nobility, the artificial wealth of the bourgeoisie and the production of the natural wealth of the farmer-artisan. Diverse functions, united by a common cooperation, *upwards*, in the supernatural community.

THE POINT OF ARRIVAL. The point of arrival must be a universal society without religious, national, economic and gender differences. A universal egalitarianism in a common sharing of *material goods*, such as housing, comfort, food, clothing and pleasures. The social milieu, necessarily *compulsive*, because the social gravitates in the modeling of the individual, will not let its compulsiveness be felt as long as it is directed in this sense, *downwards*, towards the universal and absolute disintegration of all ties.

traditional conservatism; it will appear, on the contrary, compulsive, reactive, when it tends to prevent absolute social disintegration.

THE PROCESS OF TRANSFORMATION. The transformation will be marked by the destruction of the *supernatural supremacy of the Church* operated in the Reformation; by the destruction of the Political Power operated by the English Revolution and the French Revolution with the death on the scaffold of Charles I of England and Louis XVI of France; by the Communist Revolution with the elimination of the bourgeoisie from social life. Three revolutions, the religious, the political and the economic.

The instrument of transformation: the trilogy, liberty-equality-fraternity.

The trilogy *liberty, equality and fraternity*. Let this trilogy be applied to a Christian society involving *economic, political and religious* inequalities. By virtue of its action, the religious hierarchy that affirms the universal supremacy of the Church will disappear first and foremost, and a society of free examination, *secularized*, will be left, surrendered to the absolutism of public power. Such was the society of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. To this absolutist and authoritarian society apply the trilogy liberty, equality and fraternity and *public power* will disappear and it will be given over to the *theoretical* domination of the multitudes, but effective and practical domination of the wealthy oligarchies, that is to say, of the bourgeoisie. Such was the society of the 19th century up to the present time. Then comes the turn of the proletarian class, that is to say, a more universal leveling, *universalization* of nations, professions, sexes and conditions, that is to say, the *theoretical* suppression of all authority, which means in practice *the legal reign of cunning and force* in the hands of an international clique that prepares the enthronement in turn of the *master of the world*.

It is in this last stretch that humanity enters and the instrument of transformation, also now, is the sacred trilogy, *liberty, equality, fraternity*. Why can this trilogy operate this transformation? Precisely because of its *indeterminacy*, which allows Protestants, rationalists, liberals and communists, each accepting it in his own perspective and for different *theoretical* reasons, to agree in the desire for the same practical end, in the

execution of the same common work, work in which

communicate *downward*, toward the quantitative equality of the universal materialistic city that is the city of the Revolution.

What would happen if a Catholic were to enter this path of the Revolution? That since this road operates in a direction diametrically opposed to the Catholic ideal, if he does not want to sacrifice the latter, directly and openly, he will have to make a cut, a dichotomy, a separation between the things of Religion, that is, between Christianity as the road to eternal life and the things of temporal life, that is, Christianity as the bearer of the temporal hope of the peoples.

Would Christianity not then influence social-political life? Let us distinguish: the sacred and supernatural Christianity, "Christianity as a religious creed and the way to eternal life", "as the treasure of divine truth maintained and propagated by the Church", would not have any influence. But the other "Christianity", "as the leaven of the social and political life of peoples", which takes "at times heretical forms or even forms of revolt", would influence, and so much so that by its action, by its "Christian inspiration", the social bond, constituted by the coactivity of the public authority - the *vis regitiva* of which Saint Thomas speaks⁶⁴⁰ - would dissolve and would be substituted by a "Christian" element, the famous *evangelical fraternal friendship*, and thus the also famous social-temporal refraction of the Gospel of which, at every step, Maritain speaks would be fulfilled. Because as the Gospel is Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, Progress, the social-political, is liberating, equalizing, fraternizing, and for the same reason, progressing, with the suppression of servitudes and differentiations until "the establishment of the fraternal city, in which man is liberated from misery and servitude"⁶⁴¹, progress of Humanity that could not have been greater "until the advent of the kingdom of God and the land of the risen ones, which is beyond history"⁶⁴².

Maritain's "New Christianity" with its "Christianity" is the infallible logical result of folding the Catholic cause to the cause of the Revolution. But this also entails for him the erroneous position denounced by the Vatican Council,

⁶⁴⁰ *De regimine principum*, L. 1, c. 1.

⁶⁴¹ *Les Droits*, p. 65; English ed., p. 89.

⁶⁴² *Christ. et Dém.* p. 54; English ed. p. 57.

when he says: "*naturam et gratiam perperam commiscentes*", viciously confusing nature and grace, which in turn engenders incalculable errors and deviations. Let us point out the main ones.

Exclusion of supernatural influence from social life

Man, and human society is also man, must be, in the concrete economy in which God has placed him, a natural and supernatural being. *Natural*, according to the intrinsic constituents of his corporeal-spiritual nature, governed by the demands of the rational soul whose principles have been formulated by the philosophy of Aristotle and which we have summarized above⁶⁴³. *Supernatural*, by the demands of a *new* end which exceeds all the natural capacity of man and whose principles are preserved intact only in the Catholic Church, as *doctrine*, received from the Magisterium of Christ, *Unus magister vester*⁶⁴⁴; as *grace* dispensed by the eternal priesthood of Jesus Christ, *appellatus a Deo Pontifex*⁶⁴⁵; as *law* whose jurisdiction flows from the Kingship of Jesus Christ, *quia rex sum ego*⁶⁴⁶. This *supernatural* divine order is dealt with by a *speculative-practical* science which is theology⁶⁴⁷. But it is important to point out that it is no longer philosophy that is the normative science of man's individual and social life, but theology. *Philosophy* can give incomplete norms and even these must be *subordinated* to theology. Hence the *Syllabus* condemns the proposition that says: "*The philosopher being one thing and philosophy another, the former has the right and must submit to the authority which he admits to be true; but philosophy neither can nor must submit to any authority*". For this reason Garrigou-Lagrange rightly observes that "in practice natural and supernatural things *are not to be separated*, as they are distinguished in speculation, because the *speculative* understanding abstracts from singular things in order to consider universal things, while on the contrary the *practical understanding* tends to the work to be done in particular; and in particular we cannot effectively will the ultimate natural end, abstracting from the supernatural, because man, by right of nature, can only be effective when he has a supernatural end.

⁶⁴³ See p. 71 ff.

⁶⁴⁴ Mt., XXIII, 8.

⁶⁴⁵ Heb. V, 10.

⁶⁴⁶ John, XVIII, 37.

⁶⁴⁷ St. Thomas, *Summa Theologica*, I, 1.

is obliged to obey the positive precepts of God"⁶⁴⁸ . Thus, an order of individual and social life that is not *oriented* toward the supernatural end to which man is ordained is evil and contrary to the positive will of the Creator. *Philosophy alone* not only does not save, but *loses* man. *Human nature* and human reason not only do not save, but *lose* man. Political society, even if perfectly structured in its natural condition, not only does not save but *loses* man. For it to *save* him it must, without confusion, be intrinsically united to the supernatural society which is the Church. For from its union with the Church, the State, keeping within its proper orbit, which is that of legislation of human social life, directs it as an efficacious, though indirect, means to the perfection of man. But if the State becomes *secularized*, that is, if it distances itself from the Church or weakens its union with her, any State, whether it be called democratic or totalitarian, cannot at all fulfill its mission, which is to lead men to their perfection; on the contrary, it will be an instrument of corruption. This is what happens in every liberal State, with a *radical liberalism*, Rousseau-Marx, which denies all dependence of man both on God and on another man, or with a *moderate liberalism*, Lamennais-Maritain, which, while subjecting man to God, does not subject the State to the Church.

In such a condition, *human social life* is subtracted from supernatural influence, and since individuals cannot prevent this *social life* from influencing them, in this case they will not be able to prevent it from influencing them, *naturalizing them*, that is, disordering them, by directing them to an end that is not the concrete end placed by the Creator on men. *First very serious fundamental error of Maritain's New Christianity: Exclusion of the Church from human social life.*

Carnalization of the supernatural

But to this disorder are added others, no less serious. For if human social life is subtracted from the supernatural influence of the Holy Church, it becomes *naturalized*, *secularized*, *profane*, and as, in the present state of sickness in which man comes into this world, as we have explained⁶⁴⁹ by ceasing to be Catholic, the

⁶⁴⁸ *De Revelatione*, p. 631.

⁶⁴⁹ See p. 79 et seq.

The city returns gradually, but unerringly, to the condition in which it was before Christ, among the pagans or among the Jews. And where there was a splendid and *humane* civilization, two monstrous totalitarianisms are reborn, that of force and that of law, the pagan and the Judaic. In the pagan current appear figures, although of different styles, with a common impetus of vital values, such as Erasmus, Luther, Machiavelli, Kant, Hegel, Nietzsche, and on the level of public life, the Prussian state with its culmination in Nazism.

The other current, the Judaic, has its expression in Calvin's theology, which is a Judaization of Catholicism and its social-political reality in the Puritan-Calvinist states of England and the United States; which, in turn, by their direct action on the Catholic peoples, particularly in France, produce Philosophism and the French Revolution, from which liberalism and democracy originate to end in communism.

The democratic totalitarian current founded on the famous trilogy of liberty, equality and fraternity, contains messianic elements of the Judeo-Christian tradition; hence its agents are Masons and Jews, and hence also the tactic of not confronting but substituting itself for Christianity.

Catholic liberalism, without exception from Lamennais to Maritain takes position in the Judaic current. Hence its connections with the Masonic ideal and hence its corrupting action on the level of human social life with the four great ideas of the Gospel, namely *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, Progress*.

Because the carnalization of the supernatural is a typical and unmistakably Jewish phenomenon⁶⁵⁰. The explanation is very simple. The Jewish people have *the historical vocation*, indicated by God, to bring in their *flesh*, the Messiah, the Word, made Man. The Jewish flesh, the propagation and carnal offspring is *sacred* if it is placed at the disposal of the supernatural plans of God. The spiritual trunk of the Church is Jewish: Abraham, David, the Messiah, the Apostles. But, on the other hand, if it does not subordinate the sacred character of its flesh to spiritual ends, it erects, finally, the sacred Judaic flesh, the appetite for universal and messianic domination and without losing its

⁶⁵⁰ *El judío en el misterio de la historia*, Ediciones Teoría, Buenos Aires.

sacred character of his flesh, like the apostate priest who, although he renounces, does not lose his priestly character, but makes it serve ends diametrically opposed to Christ. Judaism without Christ is anti-Christian. It handles, yes, the great Christian truths of *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity and Progress*, but in a direction and sense diametrically opposed to the supernatural of God. That is, if the expression is licit, in the sense of the "supernatural" of the devil, of him who *was a murderer from the beginning and thus did not remain in the truth; and thus there is no truth in him, when he speaks lies he speaks as one who, being himself a liar and the Father of lies*⁶⁵¹ .

The Jews tend to *carnalize* the supernatural truths by the very nature of the supernatural message that was entrusted to them in a carnal way, that is "because of the fear of the penalty, or covetousness of the temporal things that the law promised if they kept it"⁶⁵² . This is why St. Thomas teaches in the *Regiment of Princes*, that in "the ancient law earthly goods were promised by God to the religious people" and this is why the temporal and the desire for temporal domination is peculiar to the Jewish people. They tend to *carnalize* the evangelical message; for this reason, the unity and coincidence of objectives and methods of the secular struggle that is carried out against the Church, from Calvary to our days. This is also the reason for the unity and coincidence of Lamennais-Maritain's philosophism, liberalism, communism and Catholic liberalism. It is the same program, prepared by the same hand with accommodations to diverse means. *Second very serious error of Maritain's New Christianity: Carnalization of the Evangelical message in human social life.*

The carnalization of the supernatural constitutes anti-Christianity.

The pagan ignores the Church; the Jew hates it. The pagan builds a world without the supernatural; the Jew builds it with the supernatural diabolically inverted. The drama of Calvary has remained as the law of Christian history. Jesus Christ, the consummator of the Law given by Moses to the Jews, the Savior of the peoples, is crucified, *outside* the Holy City of Jerusalem, *in the name of the law*. - *We have a law and according to this law he must die,*

⁶⁵¹ John, VIII, 44.

⁶⁵² St. Thomas in Gal., IV, 1-3.

*because he became the son of God*⁶⁵³ . When the cause of Jesus Christ was made public, before the governor Pilate, the fate of the savior had been cast in the secret council of the great Rabbis. *Then the Pontiffs and Pharisees took counsel together and said, "What shall we do? This man works many miracles. If we leave him thus, all will believe in him; and the Romans will come and ruin our city and nation. Then one of them named Caiaphas, who was the high priest that year, said to them, "You do not understand anything in this matter, nor do you consider that it is expedient for you that one man should die for the sake of the people, and that the whole nation should not perish."*⁶⁵⁴ .

And when the Jewish people, in a plebiscite - the perfect democratic expression - was about to pronounce itself in favor of Jesus whose freedom was offered in exchange for that of the criminal Barabbas, *"the pontiffs instigated the people to ask rather for the freedom of Barabbas"*⁶⁵⁵ .

The death of the Savior has remained the law of Christian history. In the shadows, throughout the Christian centuries, the Synagogue conspires against the Church and against its work, Christian civilization. Tertullian pronounced a famous prophetic phrase: *"Sinagogae judeorum, fontes persecutionum"*. The Jewish synagogue is the source of persecution. And St. Paul, with apostolic authority, enunciates this law of history, when he says: *"...the Jews, who also killed the Lord Jesus and the Prophets, and have persecuted us, and displease God, and are the enemies of all men"*⁶⁵⁶ .

The Jews have to persecute the Church, cunningly, without showing their hand, and in the name of the Law. But since since the coming of Christ, *Fraternal Love* is the law in force, the great Judeo-Masonic persecution is carried out in the name of *Fraternity*. This is why the great struggle against authentic Christianity is carried out today in the name of *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, Progress, Humanity, "Christianity"*. This is the "Christianity" that fills the universe today. And in the name of this "Christianity" the secret conspiracy has resolved to eliminate from the earth the authentic Christianity that lives only in the Catholic Church. For this reason, the satanic

⁶⁵³ John, XIX, 7.

⁶⁵⁴ John, XI, 47-50.

⁶⁵⁵ Mark, XV, 11.

⁶⁵⁶ I, Thess., II, 15.

fury against priests, laymen and nations, who defend the authentic and traditional Christian values. For this reason, all the favor of the Money and the Press in support of the groups of "new Christians" who are with the Revolution. For this reason, the unprecedented boom that Maritain's "new Christianity" has taken in the world.

Because the "new Christianity" that excludes the Church from its bosom is based instead on the carnalization of *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, Progress, Humanity*, from which the anti-Christian struggle is nourished. And this is why the "new Christianity" is also profoundly *anti-Christian*. It is useless to call it "*Christianity*". "*Not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord, shall enter the kingdom of heaven,' but he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven*"⁶⁵⁷. To know how anti-Christian this "new Christianity" is, it is enough to know how it arises, what is the desired end that brings it into existence. For every city arises as the *human* work of men. Now, the men who bring it into existence in the real world, what do they seek *socially* grouped together, when they constitute it, what is the end of society, as such, that moves, governs and impels these citizens constituted as a city, what is the supreme end to which they subordinate their thoughts, intentions and operations? For if the supreme end of the *earthly* operations of the citizens of an earthly city is the love of the supernatural God, socially recognized by the supremacy of the Rights of God, the city is profoundly Christian. The economic, political, cultural, warlike life of the citizens of the city is directed, no longer by an individual intention of all or part of them, but by the very conformation of the city, towards the love and glory of the God of Revelation and of his Son Jesus Christ. All economic, cultural and political actions, if not individually at least *socially*, are *means* for man to fulfill the end for which he has been placed in this world. The city is profoundly Christian, even though individually the citizens who form it may deviate from the end for which they were created.

But an earthly city whose citizens in their *social* operations propose no other end than earthly happiness is profoundly *anti-Christian*. For if the end is earthly, the city is earthly. Let it not be said that the end is not purely earthly because it is not fraternity but evangelical fraternity.

⁶⁵⁷ Matthew, VII.

For fraternity is truly evangelical only when God being the first of the city is sought first and foremost, and in Him and through Him, fraternity is sought as a means leading to divine love. But a city whose supreme law is fraternity, even if it is evangelical, will postpone everything, even the love and glory of God, to the demands of fraternity. And since the love of God can break and divide the fraternity because of what the Lord himself said: "*Think not that I came to bring peace on earth, but the sword. For I came to separate the man from his father, and the daughter from her mother, and the son-in-law from his father-in-law*"⁶⁵⁸, it could happen that the "evangelical fraternity" expels God from the city. For it is very clear that if the love of God is supreme, by God we will have to *divide ourselves* from those who glorify the earthly. Or rather, they *will divide themselves* from us, by *dividing themselves* from God.

And here it appears how the choice of the *ultimate end of human social life* gives to all life two diametrically opposed directions. For if the ultimate end of life, of the terrestrial life, in the economic, cultural and political, is the love of God, we will accept Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, Progress, Humanity, insofar as they lead to the glorification of God, to the aggrandizement of His Divine Society, which is the Church. If, on the contrary, the ultimate goal of human social life, of lo earth, in its economic, political and cultural operations, is Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, Progress, Humanity, we will sacrifice everything to it, everything, even the rights of God, and of the Holy Church. And in a society where Peace and the Security of the Fraternity is the Supreme, the Church will not have to invoke exclusive rights; God, called Zelotes - *Ego sum Dominus tuus fortis, zelotes* -⁶⁵⁹ the *Zelotes*, will have to endure that his Rights are postponed so that peace and security and the harmony of men no suffer damage. And this earthly city, oriented to the supreme end of human Fraternity, will gradually but mathematically choke the life of the Holy Church; and even if there is no bloody persecution, by the same dynamics of the city, it will drive the Church out of itself. And if this fraternal city is called "new Christianity" in the name of the law of the Fraternity, the Holy Church of Jesus Christ will be expelled from its bosom.

Because Maritain's "New Christianity" and authentic Christianity are those two Cities, of which St. Augustine speaks that "*permixta sunt interim*, in

⁶⁵⁸ Matthew, X, 34.

⁶⁵⁹ Ex., XX, 5.

fine separabuntur, jam corde sunt separatae". Mixed now, in the end they will separate, and already now they are heartily separated.

APPENDIX I

THE PEASANT OF THE GARONNE

by Jacques Maritain

*An old layman asks himself questions on purpose
of the present tense*

This last book of Maritain is "a kind of testament written in haste in the evening of life"⁶⁶⁰. There he is, as we have known him since 1930, the Maritain of "The Degrees of Knowledge" and of "Integral Humanism"; the Maritain who applies to the plane of intellectual and spiritual life the high teachings of St. Thomas Aquinas and who reserves, on the other hand, the whole plane of the temporal life of peoples to the dynamism of the greatest aberrations of the modern world. We have dealt with this last Maritain, as it is known, back in the forties, in works entitled "From Lamennais to Maritain"⁶⁶¹, "Critique of Maritain's conception of the Human Person"⁶⁶², "Correspondance avec le R. P. Garrigou Lagrange à propos de *De Lamennais à Maritain*"⁶⁶³, "Reply to two letters of Maritain to R. P. Garrigou Lagrange O. P.", with the text of the same⁶⁶⁴. This now obliges us to take up again, and this to update our position on one of the greatest thinkers who has filled the scene of Catholic life.

⁶⁶⁰ *Le Paysan de la Garonne*, p. 363, Desclée de Brouwer, Paris, 1969.

⁶⁶¹ Editions "Our Time", 1945, and French edition by *La Cité Catholique*, Paris, 1956, translated by Father Hervé Le Lay.

⁶⁶² "Our Time", 1948.

⁶⁶³ "Our Time", 1947.

⁶⁶⁴ "Our Time", 1948.

The last forty years, which point out in an archetypal way the contradiction in which a great and powerful current of contemporary Catholicism has been struggling, since the unfortunate days when the singular figure of Lamennais elaborated his program of "l'Avenir".

*Maritain's Integral Humanism paves the way for today's
progressivism*

We have pointed out many times⁶⁶⁵ that the attacks that are directed today against the Church do not go *directly* against its spiritual content but against its temporal realization. They want to eradicate the temporal work of the Church. They want to destroy Christian civilization. Pius XI saw this clearly in his letter "Divini Redemptoris", in which, in condemning atheistic communism, he pointed out that it "tends to destroy the social order and to undermine the very foundations of Christian civilization". And like this, one could accumulate many texts of the Roman Church that warn that the attacks of impiety do not go directly against the spiritual mission of the Church, but against her civilizing work, against the Christian public order, against the Catholic City.

It is clear that this attack is intended to make the very spiritual mission of the Church impossible. For once Christian civilization has been destroyed and the temporal substance of peoples has been given over to indifferentism and atheism, the masses must also be atheized by the permanent and irresistible influence of public life. There can be no Christians in a pagan world. At least, there can be no Christians except as an exceptional phenomenon.

This on the one hand. But there is also another situation that should be borne in mind. If, in one way or another, the existence of a non-Christian and, consequently, atheistic society *is legitimized*; if a public order of life that does not conform to the Gospel is recognized as a *right*, and if, for the same reason, the modern order of values is considered *good*, then the influence that the practical order of life must exert on the speculative cannot be avoided. For if it is true that the speculative influences and determines the practical, it is also true that the practical influences the speculative and determines the practical.

⁶⁶⁵ *El Comunismo en la Revolución Anticristiana*, 2nd ed., Ediciones Theoría, 1964.

and determines the speculative. What one thinks influences what one does and what one does, and what one lives, ultimately determines what one thinks. This correspondence between the speculative and the practical order is demanded by the unity of human life.

Such appreciations are very important and must be taken into account in order to measure the nature and scope of the progressivism that has invaded Catholic circles and that is wreaking havoc today first of all in the speculative sector of the Church, in philosophers and theologians, and from there in seminaries and houses of formation, to then shape the minds of the younger generations of priests and religious and, from there, the entire Christian people. Why does progressivism reach and touch today the speculative sector of the Church when only thirty years ago it only touched the practical sector? Here, in this point, lies the essence of the present question and here appears the gravity of Maritain's defection that took place back in the thirties. Until then, Maritain was a fully Thomistic philosopher, not only in purely speculative questions, especially in metaphysical ones, but also in practical and cultural ones. He had made his magnificent studies on "La Philosophie bergsonienne" and on "Réflexions sur l'intelligence et sur saviie propre" and had also published his "Trois Reformateurs" and, above all, his "Antimoderne". Maritain recognized then that not only the *speculative* life but also the *practical* life of the people should be entirely adjusted to the evangelical law, whose principles in the scientific field had been marvelously expounded by St. Thomas Aquinas. Maritain did not compromise with the errors of the modern world either on the level of pure intelligence or on the level of life. Society *should* also *be Christian* and when he said Christian, he recognized that, besides being subject to the natural law in its proper order, it should recognize the superior order of values contributed by Christ. And society had to be Christian as a requirement of its own existence, for only in this way could it maintain its specific mission of safeguarding human values and only in this way could it avoid the danger of becoming a source of degradation and ruin for man himself. "It is important to integrate the immense material of life contained in the modern world, but it is fitting to *hate the modern world* considered in that which it looks upon as its *own distinctive glory: independence with respect to God*. We hate therefore the bourgeois revolutionary iniquity that envelops and vitiates civilization today as we hate the proletarian revolutionary iniquity that wants to annihilate it. It is for God and not for modern society that we want to work? In short, it is not for the

efforts of men who hope for salvation but of him of whom it has been said "Nec enim aliud sub coelo nomen datum est hominibus in quo oporteat nos salvos fieri""⁶⁶⁶ . "A Christian nation *cannot* consolidate its greatness on principles contrary to the laws of the Gospel, nor by sacrificing the common interests of the Christian republic. What has come out of it for France and for the world (for this sin, far from being peculiar to France, has been as great or greater in other countries, is the lot of the whole modern world and proceeded from an implacable logic. It has often been observed that the same principles *of insurrection of the part against the whole* which were invoked against the pope, must necessarily serve against kings and, later, against the fatherland itself. Nogaret is a cousin of Robespierre and Lenin. *The refusal to submit to the Church must necessarily entail the refusal to submit to God* and to recognize his rights over the State as such. The royalist decrees of the Parliaments are the drafts of the secular laws"⁶⁶⁷ .

But, from 1930 onwards, a radical change is verified in Maritain: "In short, it seems that by withdrawing into himself, man has suffered, as if in spite of himself, the movement of introversion proper to the spirit; he has entered within himself, and not to seek God. A general progress *in self-awareness* has thus characterized the modern era. While the world turned away from spirituality par excellence and from this love which is our true end to go towards external goods and towards the exploitation of sensible nature, the universe of immanence opened, sometimes through low doors, a subjective deepening discovered to science, to art, to poetry, to the very passions of man, and to his vices, *his own spirituality, the demand for freedom* became all the more acute the more it departed from the true conditions and from the true notion of freedom. Briefly, by virtue of the ambivalence of history, *the reflex age*, with all the diminutions and losses connoted by this word, entailed an *undeniable enrichment*, to be taken as a *gain-acquired in the knowledge of the creature and of human things*, even if this knowledge was to lead to the inner hell of man, a victim of himself. *This dark path never ceases to have an exit and the fruits gathered in passing have been incorporated into our substance*"⁶⁶⁸ .

⁶⁶⁶ *Antimoderne*, p. 216.

⁶⁶⁷ *Primaute du Spirituel*, p. 115.

⁶⁶⁸ *Religion and Culture*, p. 30.

Here Maritain no longer emphasizes this "independence of God" as a *formal* constituent of the modern world, he no longer directs his energies to denounce this essential perversity so that man understands that he cannot, *by this path of the modern world*, attain health, but that he must convert, that is to say, he must turn away from this good that he loves in a disorderly way, and turn to the unchangeable good, from which he had ungodly and disastrously separated himself. He must turn away from the good that he loves in a disorderly way, and turn to the unchangeable good, from which he had ungodly and unjustly separated himself, in order to love in an orderly way, integrating into the essential and unchanging order of things those diminished goods and even progress that might *accidentally* be linked to the modern world; Now, on the other hand, he emphasizes this "self-awareness," this "gain acquired in the knowledge of the creature and of human things," and insinuates it as a formal constituent of the modern world; but he considers this *independence from God* as something *accidental*, although with tragic consequences, because it would prevent him from realizing his profound and authentic aspirations. Consequently, it is no longer necessary to hate the modern world that "aspires without knowing it to a civilization whose principles St. Thomas indicates"⁶⁶⁹ .

It should be noted that Maritain in his later works continues to attack the atheistic positions of the modern world, the liberalism of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and atheistic communism, but he does not attack the modern world as such, that is, in its attempt to *reach the Christian order by the path of public rights or freedoms of conscience and press*; nor does he attack communism in its fundamental tendency of wanting to *emancipate man from all servitude*⁶⁷⁰ , he attacks it for its atheism.

This *misunderstanding* must allow him to maintain with a semblance of logic an extremely misleading position. For, on the one hand, if the modern world were bad because it is atheistic, if it were baptized, that is, if it were stripped of atheism, it would seem that it could already be good. And then, as people continue in the

⁶⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 41.

⁶⁷⁰ In the emancipation from all servitude, Maritain and the Christian progressives always move in a dangerous equivocation, inasmuch as they reject as intrinsically unjust all subjection or

servitude of the inferior to the superior, of the servant to the master, when it is not so, since the evangelical law demands that "servants be in all fear subject to their masters" (I Peter, 2, 18). Servitude is only unjust when it violates the exercise of justice, but not by its very nature.

In the same line of the modern world or of the Revolution - without abandoning their aspirations for emancipation from all servitude, without renouncing modern public freedoms, and the desire for self-government - they would return to the Church and to the love of God. Herein lies the dismal illusion. Because this path, even if for the use of Catholics it is varnished or impregnated with a "Catholic" *ideology*, is *intrinsically* perverse and leads only to ruin. Maritain's thesis is therefore an *ideology* which, although opposed to the Rousseauian, Marxist or Prudhonnian *ideologies*, *substantially* coincides with them in the line of the Revolution. And for the same reason it is profoundly *utopian* insofar as it pretends to reach a goal - Christianity - *intrinsically* impossible by *that path*; and it is also profoundly *disastrous*, insofar as, in fact and by the internal logic of things, it is obliged to "escort", in the expression of Pius X, those perverse ideologies⁶⁷¹ .

Hence Maritain invents his "New Christianity essentially different from the traditional one"; Christianity *substantially* secularist and naturalist; *substantially* liberal and progressive, on the way to communism; *substantially* humanist and personalist.

And to this Maritainian "misunderstanding" of a Christianity first of all secular, we must add another "misunderstanding", that of a *substantially* naturalistic and secularist society where "the social-temporal refraction of the evangelical truths" would be overturned. ⁶⁷²society in which the evangelical and supernatural ferment, far from raising man towards God, would push him in its revolutionary and secularist impulse.

With his thesis of the "New Lay Christianity", Maritain opens the broad channel of the new problematic in the field of the relationship between the Church and the world, in Catholic intellectual circles, a problematic that, on the one hand, rejects the traditional position of a temporal order indirectly subordinated to the supernatural and, on the other hand, legitimizes the secularist aspirations of the modern world as conforming and adjusted to the evangelical law. Behind Jacques Maritain must come Emmanuel Mounier, who with revolutionary "pathos" will inoculate in the new Catholicism the definitive rupture with the

⁶⁷¹ Jules Meinvielle, *From Lamennais to Maritain*, pp. 53ff.

⁶⁷² *Humanisme Intégral*, pp. 226, and *Le Paysan de la Garonne*, I, p. 59.

traditional conception of Christian civilization and must channel Catholic forces towards the dynamism of the socialist currents that are invading today's society. The "*Thomist*" theology of Chenu and Congar must be radically distorted by the new historical-theological problematic and must open the way to a universal progressivism that will then invade both the practical and speculative levels of values.

The progressivism that is currently invading the Church from all sides does not come exclusively from the Maritainian error. It is tributary of many other speculative and practical currents that agitate the turbulent modern world. But Maritain, with his undisputed authority, and in the name of St. Thomas, has broken in our days the just idea of the incompatibility of Church and modern world. Here he has opened the way to all progressive errors, to those that were to come from Freudianism and socialism as well as to those derived from idealism, phenomenology and evolutionism.

"Le paysan de la Garonne", repudiated by progressives and traditionalists

In "*Le paysan de la Garonne*", Maritain rejects today the progressive speculative errors that result in the introduction of idealism, phenomenology and Theilhardism in Christian philosophy and theology. This rejection seems to us to be correct. But we believe it to be insufficient. Hence Maritain has nothing valid to respond to the censures that the progressives make of his last book. In "*Temoignage Chrétien*" (December 15, 1966), the Dominican Francis Biot writes about Maritain: "It is true that the author does not recognize in what is most alive in the Church today the consequences of the principles to which he continues to adhere.... That a man retired to his hermitage, having reached an advanced age, can no longer understand the development of the very thing he has contributed to set in motion, should not surprise us".

Congar, while admitting that certain theologians have proposed insufficient, criticizable, even erroneous answers to the problems that arise today, writes: "But there are others. Not only are they not spoken of - they are quoted

The Council's theological work is not only praised by Jacques Maritain, but also by certain names that are personal friends, but formulas are used that are so general that one would believe that the majority of theologians fall into this modernism that is denounced. On the other hand, Jacques Maritain exalts the theological work of the Council; on some neuralgic points, he gives it the testimony, not only of adhesion, but of admiration. Now, this theology is not a spontaneous generation: who has worked for it? Are not these theologians whom the book, by their silence, would lead us to believe that they did not exist or that they have made a pact with error? It seems to me that this glance of an old layman, loved and respected, on the present time, runs the risk of appearing partial because of what he refrains from evoking from the life of this same present time".

Biot himself, after censuring Maritain's trial of his spiritual sons as treason and infidelity, concludes by saying: "For the honor of Maritain himself and for the authority he represents in Catholicism today, it is a pity that his friends have not dissuaded him from publishing the last book. It adds nothing, on the contrary, to what we owe him".

Progressives have mercilessly censured him. And rightly so. The traditionalists, whom Maritain harshly criticizes as fundamentalists - and fundamentalism is "the worst offense to divine Truth and human intelligence" -⁶⁷³ have not spared him criticism and censure. Louis Salleron writes⁶⁷⁴ : "But Maritain has done nothing but declare his faith and express it in the highest degrees of knowledge. He has applied his philosophical thought to the problems of the temporal. And here he completely derails". But there is an internal logic between progressivism and modernism. And very well adds Salleron when he says⁶⁷⁵ : "This internal logic is recalled by Father Biot to Maritain, while Father Congar confesses to him his sorrow and urges him to enter soon in the warmth of his hermitage to avoid the drafts which are deadly in winter".

Jean Madiran, magnificently interpreting the traditionalist current of Catholicism, has the right to ask: "How does Maritain, a political philosopher, therefore situate himself with respect to the social doctrine of the Church?"

⁶⁷³ *Le Paysan de la Garonne*, p. 235.

⁶⁷⁴ *Itinéraires*, April 1967, p. 39.

⁶⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 46.

"Not in the same way, surely, as the metaphysical Maritain is situated with respect to his theological doctrine.

"He invokes "Aeterni Patris" of Leo XIII and all the pontifical documents that recommend the doctrine of St. Thomas; he is in this line, he relies on it.

"He does not invoke "Rerum Novarum", "Quadragesimo Anno", nor the other great social and political encyclicals, he does not seek support in them, nor does he mention them only as to rare aspects, generally lateral, accidental or isolated. On the other hand, the founding of the Review *Esprit* in 1932 marks at least a partial break, according to Mounier's will and inspiration, with the social doctrine as it is formulated in the modern encyclicals".

In reality, as we shall see in due course, Maritain considers the Christian social order -Christian civilization- as cancelled and works to "Christianize" the city of the Revolution.

Maritain's progressive position on the spiritual-temporal relation

The Maritainian misunderstanding that makes him the father of present-day Christian progressivism stems from a defective formulation of the relationship between the temporal and the spiritual. This defective formulation has already been denounced in the Constitution "Unigenitus Dei Filius" of Vatican I when it states: "Because of this impiety which has spread everywhere, it has unfortunately happened that even many children of the Catholic Church have strayed from the path of true piety and the Catholic sense has been diminished in them with a gradual diminution of the truths. For dragged along by various and pilgrim doctrines, making a bad mixture of nature and grace, of human science and divine faith, it turns out as the facts show that they have depraved the genuine sense of the dogmas and endanger the integrity and sincerity of the faith."

Naturam et gratiam perperam commiscentes. From this admonition of the First Vatican Council we must retain mainly these words. *Making a bad mixture of nature and grace.* Here lies the typical Maritainian error, as already noted in his time by the Dominican scholar Santiago Ramirez when in "Divus Tomas".

of Fribourg dedicated a study to the famous Ethics subordinated to Maritain's theology.

This problem of nature and grace is presented in various theological treatises and its correct elucidation is of capital importance, especially in the Church's relations with the temporal life of peoples. For the total life of man which develops here on earth unfolds in two essentially different rhythms and therefore falls under two different jurisdictions which, however, must recognize some harmonization, if the radical unity of that same life and of man is not to be broken.

The Church is an essentially religious, sacred and supernatural society. Is there not an incompatibility between these characteristics and the visible organization of the Church? Because the supernatural is always related to the divine nature, to the Deity himself, which as such admits neither visibility nor organization. Undoubtedly, but since man is a bodily being, diverse organizational and visible elements can be used as a vehicle of the supernatural. From this arises the unspeakable mystery of the Church - a mystery that prolongs the Incarnation - and although it consists in the effective union of man with the most intimate and recondite of God, it has a reality that becomes sensible among human things. The men then, the doctrine, the sacraments, the hierarchy and the ecclesiastical government that arise from the reception of the supernatural gifts, are visible elements that participate in the invisible supernatural. For this reason, what measures the supernatural condition of things is not properly speaking the nature of the elements that can integrate it but the *direct end* to which these things are destined. Therefore, temples and properties, institutions, doctrines, sacraments, legislation, government and individuals *directly* linked to the mission of the Church enter into the supernatural and sacred sphere of the Church.

But man has *concerns* and activities that are not *directly* ordered to eternal life. These are economic, political and cultural problems. It is the whole field of civilization. It is everything that *directly* ensures a prosperous and happy coexistence of man during the days of his pilgrimage on earth. In this civilization enters then all that directly and of itself are means for this prosperity. The psalmist⁶⁷⁶ describes these goods when he writes:

⁶⁷⁶ Psalms, 143:12-15.

"Whose sons are like new plantations in the flower of their age; whose daughters are compounded and adorned on every side, like idols in a temple; whose larders are full and overflowing with all kinds of fruits; whose sheep are fertile and go out to graze in numerous flocks; whose cows are fat and full of fatness; whose walls are neither gates nor ruins, nor cries of weeping are heard in their squares. Happy shall they call the people who enjoy all these things".

Eternal happiness has, then, another series of means which *of themselves and directly* lead to it, just as there is another series of means which *of themselves and directly* lead to temporal or profane happiness. What, then, is the sure and ultimate criterion for distinguishing the goods that belong to the Church from those that belong to the order of civilization? Certainly not their intrinsic nature, since in the temporal order there are elements of a spiritual and even supernatural nature, such as politics itself, the pure sciences and the exercise of virtues, even supernatural ones, and in the order of the Church there are material elements such as temples and the support of the ministers of worship. Therefore, the *direct end*, to which these goods are destined, constitutes the criterion for discerning the goods that make up civilization or the Church.

In Maritain this criterion of discernment not only does not appear throughout his works, but, on the contrary, an inextricable confusion of planes always appears. Thus, for example, he speaks there and says that "there is a temporal mission of the Christian in front of the world and human progress". "Christians and non-Christians now I no longer consider them simply *as men*, but *as members of Christ*, explicitly if they are Christians, implicitly if they are non-Christians but have the grace of Christ, potentially if they are non-Christians and do not have the grace of Christ" (*Le Paysan de la Garonne*, p. 108). But if this is so, "it is no longer by reason of a common practical objective and action, to be carried out in common, that men must agree on common practical principles, "but by reason of belonging to the mystical Body through grace" (*Ibid.*, pp. 108-109). Therefore, the same temporal mission of the Christian, his very belonging to a civil society for the civil progress of the world, the same "temporal" end of this society has a meaning by reason of belonging to the Mystical Body, that is, to the Church and to grace. For this reason, Maritain can affirm that the mission of the Christian in civil society consists in making the Gospel pass through the world; for this reason, in the new age, the mission of the Christian in civil society consists in making the Gospel pass through the world.

it is the divine things to whom it corresponds to defend human things"⁶⁷⁷ . In other words, it confuses and mixes the temporal with the supernatural, and attempts to justify the temporal mission that corresponds to the Christian, as a man and a citizen, with his character as a Christian.

It is clear that the clear distinction between the two orders of values, those that belong to the Church and those that belong to civilization, should not prevent us from pointing out the harmony and unity that must be established between the two for a correct, orderly and fruitful human coexistence. Although the values of the Church are clearly distinguished from the values of civilization *fine operis*, by reason of the end of each of the values themselves, nevertheless they are united inasmuch as the Christian, *fine operantis*, by reason of the ultimate end with which he is to seek all things, must engage in the temporal in view of eternal life. And here, in attention to the *finis operantis*, the Christian must concern himself with the things of the earth and of civilization *insofar* as they can lead him to his ultimate theological end.

Here, through the action of the Christian, in the most intimate and authentic part of his work, the subordination of civilizing action to the Church is fulfilled and, with it, Christianity, Christian civilization, the Catholic city, is realized. "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul and with all your mind. This is the greatest and first of the commandments. The second, like unto it, is, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two precepts hang all the law and the prophets."⁶⁷⁸ . "Whether you eat or drink or whatever you do, do all to the glory of God"⁶⁷⁹ . The Christian, therefore, fulfills his whole temporal life in direct dependence on the ultimate end that imposes on him to love God above all things. Consequently, his whole temporal life is sacred, supernatural, moved by the Church. Hence, consequently, the Christian cannot fail to work for Christianity, for Christian civilization, by the very fact of being and behaving as a Christian.

From this it appears that *the autonomy of the temporal*, on which Maritain insists excessively, and after him Congar and Chenu, as if there could be a purely neutral temporal social order *by right*, is impossible on the existential and concrete plane on which man has been created. It is one thing to be able to conceive of an *essence* of the

⁶⁷⁷ See *Renovatio*, Genoa, April-June 1967, p. 319.

⁶⁷⁸ St. Matthew, 22:17.

⁶⁷⁹ 1 Cor. 10:31.

temporal life, moving for a purely natural end, and it is quite another thing if this *essence* can be verified outside a theological and purely natural context. The concrete *temporal* life of peoples has to develop on the existential plane within a theology, theology of God or theology of the devil, but, in any case, theology.

There is no *natural* end of the world as an autonomous and independent whole. The *natural* end of the world must be achieved as an end *dependent* on another supernatural higher end. Hence the world no can attain the *temporal* or purely natural happiness to which it aspires only in dependence upon the Kingdom of God. It is, moreover, the teaching of the Savior himself. "Seek first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all else will be given to you besides"⁶⁸⁰ .

Hence the seriousness of the error of Maritain and of progressive theologians, such as Congar and Chenu who follow him in this, when they insist on maintaining that man, contrary to his theological end, can reach the natural end of world history which consists in the "dominion of man over nature and the conquest of human harmony"⁶⁸¹ . This is totally impossible because it contradicts the condition of human conduct which, in actual providence, makes it impossible for him to attain the secondary end of the temporal as opposed to the primary end of the supernatural. Herein lies precisely the drama of the modern world. It tries to achieve the temporal happiness of humanity in a context of sufficiency and absolute autonomy of man. And in this context it not only fails to solve the elementary problems of man's bread and peace, but turns the world into the infernal labyrinth of the present age. It forgets that the problem of man, today as throughout history, is not specifically a problem of technical resources. It is not even economic, political or cultural. The problem is primarily *theological*, that is, it concerns man's primordial relationship with the laws of the Creator. If this problem is not first of all given the right solution, man will become an egomaniac and proud of his own autonomy, incapable of regulating his relations with his neighbor according to justice and charity. And in this context it is totally impossible, whatever the technological capacity at one's disposal, to ensure an equitable and harmonious distribution of human resources that facilitates an elementary peaceful coexistence of men.

⁶⁸⁰ Matt. 6:33.

⁶⁸¹ *Le Paysan de la Garonne*, p. 65 ff.

*Maritain's progressivism in the use of the supernatural as
revolutionary leaven*

Maritain alters the correct conception of the relations of the temporal with the supernatural. "Naturam et gratiam perperam commiscentes". From here another Maritainian error must follow, that of using Christianity as a revolutionary leaven to pervert the order of law and natural law that must govern the relations of the temporal coexistence of peoples.

This Maritainian error is not clearly formulated either in this or in Maritain's previous books. It is disguised in the subtle disquisitions with which he skillfully covers his thought, and we have pointed it out above in the texts in which confusion is made between the temporal and the supernatural. However, there is a page that is symptomatic and illustrative of this error. Here it is:

"May I be permitted to add today that up to the present - in spite of (or because of) the entry on the scene, in various countries, of so-called "Christian" political parties (the majority being mainly combinations of electoral interests) - the hope in the advent of a *Christian politics* (responding in the practical order to what is a *Christian philosophy* in the speculative order) has been completely frustrated; I know of but one example of an authentic "Christian revolution": that which President Eduardo Frei is attempting at this moment in Chile, and it is not certain that it will succeed. It is also certain that among all my contemporaries still alive as I write these lines, I see only three revolutionaries worthy of the name in the countries of the West: Eduardo Frei in Chile, Saul Alinsky in America, and myself in France, although my vocation as a philosopher has already clouded my possibilities as an agitator..."⁶⁸². And there is a footnote by Alinsky, which says: "Saul Alinsky, one of my great friends, is an indomitable and feared organizer of the "popular communities" and an anti-racist leader, whose methods are as effective as they are unorthodox. Cf. *Harper's Magazine*, June and July 1965, or *The Professional Radical, Conversations with Saul Alinsky*."

So the exemplars of a *Christian policy* are Eduardo Frei, who is producing anarchy and disorder in the noble republic of Chile, and the firebrand

⁶⁸²Ibid., pp. 40-41.

revolutionary Saul Alinsky, known as a promoter of riots and disturbances of racial minorities in the United States. The caliber of this Alinsky has been present in the serious disorders in the Los Angeles suburb of Watts, which forced the Army to intervene to put an end to the arson, looting and murders. This Alinsky has also dedicated himself to organizing Mexican farmers in the State of California to confront them with Anglo-Saxon farmers. He is now engaged in subverting the colored slums of Chicago and Detroit.

In *Harper's magazine* Maritain praised Saul Alinsky, of whom he says that "he has known and loved him for many years, and whom he considers as one of the great men of the century, even though he knows nothing of God or the immortality of the soul".

This eloquently reveals to us what Maritain understands by *Christian politics*. It is not a politics that conforms to the traditional laws of natural law, taking into account the supernatural destiny of man, but a politics that, even on the specifically natural level, is disturbed by Christian principles that act in it as a revolutionary ferment. I have studied this point at length⁶⁸³, making it clear that Maritain in his *Integral Humanism* has incurred precisely in Rousseau's error, denounced by Maritain himself⁶⁸⁴. He says: "Rousseau, above all, has denaturalized the Gospel, tearing it away from the supernatural order, transporting certain aspects of Christianity to the plane of simple nature. Absolutely essential to Christianity is the supernaturalness of grace. Take away this supernaturalness, and Christianity is corrupted. What do we find at the origin of modern Christianity? A *naturalization* of Christianity. It is clear that the Gospel, made purely natural (and therefore absolutely corrupted) becomes a ferment of revolution of extraordinary virulence.... This is why we find everywhere in the modern world degraded analogies of Catholic mysticism and shreds of secularized Christianity".

This *naturalistic* use of Christianity committed by Rousseau will also be made by Maritain. Thus, in his works on "*Christian politics*", he speaks of a "Christianity" that is the leaven of social and political life, the bearer of hope.

⁶⁸³ *From Lamennais to Maritain*, chapters: The New Christianity, City of Revolution and Conclusion.

⁶⁸⁴ *Trois Reformateurs*, p. 204.

Christianity" as *distinct* from Christianity as a religious creed, from Christianity as the treasure of divine truth, maintained and propagated by the Church, Christianity that takes heretical and revolutionary forms⁶⁸⁵ .

In his political works, Maritain uses perversely, *naturalizing them*, four supernatural values of the Word of God, which are liberty, equality, fraternity and progress. St. Paul, preaching to the Galatians, says: "For you, brethren, are called to a state of liberty"⁶⁸⁶ . And he also tells them there: "There is no distinction between Jew and Greek, between slave and free, between male and female. For ye are all one in Jesus Christ"⁶⁸⁷ . He also tells them: "Let your charity be sincere, abhorring evil, adhering to one another, loving one another with brotherly love..."⁶⁸⁸ . Finally, pondering the progress to be made in the Christian life, he says to them: "...until we all arrive...at the state of a perfect man according to the measure of the perfect age according to which Christ is to be formed mystically in us"⁶⁸⁹ . These four ideas of St. Paul have *direct* value on the supernatural plane where the authentic disciple of Christ, the saint, attains the freedom of the children of God who are not guided by the law but by the spirit and in whom he recognizes the equality and brotherhood of men in Christ and in whose adherence he attains the perfect fullness of the divine. But they cannot be applied *directly* to the political and social plane, as if it were licit on that plane to live outside the law, ignoring the natural and social inequalities that arise from the diverse nations, cultures and capacities. To apply *directly* to the natural and social political plane the teachings of the Apostle would be tantamount to inoculating revolution and disorder in the temporal plane of peoples⁶⁹⁰ . This explains why Maritainism makes the apology of the agitator Alinsky and of revolutionary and leftist governments such as Frei's, and why Maritain has also been invoked in the last twenty-five years as the inspiring theoretician of the utopian positions of Christian democracy and of a presumed "Christianity" of social Revolution.

⁶⁸⁵ See especially *Christianisme et Démocratie*, p. 43.

⁶⁸⁶ St. Paul, 5, 13.

⁶⁸⁷ Ibid., 3, 28.

⁶⁸⁸ Rom., 12, 9.

⁶⁸⁹ Ephes., 4, 13.

⁶⁹⁰ Jules Meinvielle, *From Lamennais to Maritain*, chapter: Conclusion.

Maritain's progressivism alters the sense of history carried by modern peoples

When Maritain distorts the relations of nature and grace and when he converts the supernatural into a revolutionary leaven of the politics of nations, he alters by the same token the correct evaluation of the progress of modern peoples. Maritain thinks that although there is much evil, the world, in the end, is good, and always advances towards better and higher states. This teaching of Maritain on the necessarily progressive movement of history we have exposed it at length in another place⁶⁹¹ and here we can only study it as it appears again formulated in *Le Paysan de la Garonne*. Maritain says in this book: "The ontosophical truth at stake when it comes to the world considered in itself, is that in spite of the evil that is there - so great at times that it is intolerable not only to the sensibility but to the very spirit of man - the good, taking everything into account, is greater, deeper and deeper. The world is good in its structures and in its natural purposes. However stagnant, however regressive it may seem in certain places on earth and at certain times, its historical development, seen as a whole, is moving towards better and higher states, and it is a duty for us to have, in spite of everything, confidence in it, because, if evil grows at the same time as good (and how one needs to be one of the new good thinkers doped by the three *cosmological* virtues not to see this) good yet grows there more"⁶⁹².

Maritain affirms here that in the world good prevails over evil and although the latter is great and intolerable, in the end man, and therefore the world, *marches towards better and higher states*. With this he wants to justify the development of the modern world which, in spite of the fact that in the last five centuries has been moving away from the Church, source of the grace that heals and elevates, and towards atheism, ultimately marches towards the fundamental good of the liberation and autonomy of man. The peoples, in substance, would walk the path of progress in spite of the march of evil. The modern revolutions, which since the Renaissance have plunged man into a state of gradual and inexorable degradation, would be as many stages towards the triumphal goal of man victorious over the servitudes of nature and of other men.

⁶⁹¹ Ibid., chapter: From the Myth of Progress to the New Christianity.

⁶⁹² *Le Paysan de la Garonne*, p. 64.

This obviously implies a false assessment of the history of the last five centuries and an erroneous appreciation of the process of the modern Revolution.

As we have explained exhaustively⁶⁹³, to be fully appreciated this process must be understood as a systematic action for the total destruction of man in his theological, political and economic dimension, and his integration into the machine society built by the Synarchy, which has now taken over the march of the peoples and is preparing for world government. The world, far from moving towards the autonomy of man, is on the march towards the scientific enslavement of peoples. The estrangement from God that the secularization of history entails also implies the degradation and total destruction of man. In a world without God, neither can men have bread and peace. For peace is granted to men *in dependence* on the glory of God, which must be previously established.

Maritain's position ultimately suffers from Pelagianism in underestimating the defects that original sin has left imprinted in human nature. Even if man is good at the root of the nature that has come good from the hand of God and is therefore curable, it is not so as long as it is not comforted in exercise by sound grace. Hence, the prevalence of good over evil that Maritain attributes to the works of man openly contradicts the teaching of St. John the Evangelist when he says that "the light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light"⁶⁹⁴.

Maritain's progressive interpretation of Vatican II documents

Maritain, determined to maintain his equivocal and dangerous positions of his *Integral Humanism*, interprets the decisions of Vatican II as if they were the confirmation of his risky theories. Thus, he writes rejoicing: "In truth, all the vestiges of the Holy Empire are today liquidated; we have definitively left the sacral age and the baroque age; after sixteen centuries that it would be shameful to slander and pretend to repudiate, but that have decidedly ended to die and

⁶⁹³ *La Iglesia y el Mundo moderno*, Theoria, Buenos Aires, 1966.

⁶⁹⁴ 3, 19.

whose grave defects were not questionable, a new age begins, where the Church nos invited to understand *the goodness and humanity* of God our Father, and nos called to recognize at the same time all the dimensions of this *hominem integrum* of which the Pope spoke in his speech of December 7, 1965 at the last session of the Council"⁶⁹⁵ .

It is quite possible that the concrete historical regime of the Holy Empire has been liquidated. But Christendom, Christian Civilization, the Catholic City, the public temporal order subordinated to the Church, which the teaching of Leo XIII up to Paul VI recalls and which, in substance, constitutes the profound significance of *the concord of priesthood and empire*, as Leo XIII's "*Immortale Dei*" teaches, far from having been liquidated, is affirmed in a thousand ways in the Documents of Leo XIII, as taught in Leo XIII's "*Immortale Dei*", far from having been liquidated, is affirmed in a thousand ways in the Documents of Vatican II, especially in "*Lumen Gentium*", "*Gaudium et Spes*" and "*Apostolicam Actuositatem*" on the apostolate of the laity.

It is clear that these documents can be interpreted as they should be in the context of the social doctrine of the Church or violated with the progressive mentality, either of the progressivism halfway to Maritainism or of the integral progressivism that Maritain censures in *Le Paysan de la Garonne*. But this second interpretation does not correspond because it is not legitimate to question *the continuity* of the apostolic magisterium and because it also implies forcing the obvious interpretation of the words of Vatican II, as we shall see.

There is no difficulty in admitting that the doctrine of the Church on the temporal order can be presented in two different perspectives. The first exposition, which we could call the *Christian regime*, and which is the classic one of Leo XIII, St. Pius X and Pius XI, assumes that the Christian temporal order is still in force, at least in substance, and takes it as a point of reference while speaking of its restoration. Vatican II, on the other hand, seems to place itself in another perspective, as if the regime of Christianity were no longer in force and as if it were necessary to begin by taking as a starting point that of a totally de-Christianized society. This second exposition takes into account preferably the *initiation* of the Christian temporal order, when it has not yet been possible to forge a public opinion that could sustain a Christian public

power. It is evident

⁶⁹⁵ *Le Paysan de la Garonne*, p. 13.

that the World Revolution has succeeded in totally de-Christianizing the ancient Christian peoples and that the destruction of the Christian regime and the establishment of a secularist and atheistic public order have already been achieved. Under these conditions, it would not make sense for the Church to promote a *pastoral* action of Christianization of political power when it is first a question of carrying out a more elementary Christianization of isolated environments in which only Catholics can hardly act. But the Christianization of public power, far from being excluded, is demanded by the duties incumbent upon the laity in their consecration of the world. "Let the virtue of the Gospel shine forth in daily, family and social life"⁶⁹⁶. Let them (the laity) not hide this hope (of future glory) in the interiority of the soul, but let them manifest it in continual dialogue and struggle with *the rulers of this dark world, against the evil spirits* (Eph. 6:12) even through the structures of secular life"⁶⁹⁷. And among these structures, one must obviously include those of the legitimate power that comes from God.

The Church exhorts the laity to strive earnestly "that by their competence in profane affairs and by their activity, elevated from within by the grace of Christ, the creative goods may be developed at the service of each and every one of her people and be better distributed among them, according to the plan of the Creator and the illumination of his Word"⁶⁹⁸.

"*Lumen Gentium* also reminds the laity that they have rights and obligations (some) as members of the Church and others as members of human society. That both rights must be "harmoniously coupled with one another, remembering that, in every temporal matter, they must be guided by Christian conscience, since no human activity, not even in the temporal order (and is public power a temporal activity?), can escape the rule of God.

The document "*Gaudium et Spes*" on the Church in today's world is all aimed at exhorting "Christians, citizens of the temporal city and of the eternal city, to fulfill their temporal duties faithfully, guided always by the spirit of the Gospel".... "Consequently, no artificial opposition is created between the temporal and the eternal city.

⁶⁹⁶ *Lumen Gentium*, 35.

⁶⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 36.

⁶⁹⁸ Ibid., 36.

professional and social occupations, on the one hand, and religious life on the other. The Christian who fails in his temporal obligations fails in his duties to his neighbor, fails, above all, in his obligations to God, and endangers his eternal salvation. Following the example of Christ, who exercised craftsmanship, Christians should rejoice in being able to exercise all their temporal activities, making a vital synthesis of human, family, professional, scientific or technical effort, with religious values, under whose highest hierarchy everything cooperates to the glory of God"⁶⁹⁹ .

And the decree "Apostolicam actuositatem" on the apostolate of the laity could not be more explicit in the long chapter it devotes to "the Christian establishment of the temporal order." "It is necessary, however, says the document, that the laity take as their obligation the restoration of the temporal order, and that, led in this by the light of the Gospel and by the mind of the Church and moved by Christian charity, they work directly and concretely; that they cooperate with one another with their special knowledge and with their own responsibility, and that they seek everywhere and in everything the kingdom of God. The temporal order must be established in such a way that, while fully observing its own laws, it is in conformity with the principles of Christian life, adapted to the varied circumstances of place, time and peoples".

There is nothing in Vatican II that favors Maritain's "revolutionary" use of the Gospel to corrupt the temporal order, and everything, instead, to affirm that the temporal life of peoples, following its natural dynamism, must be adjusted to the Christian order of values.

Manichaeism in Maritainian progressivism

Maritain, in *Le Paysan de la Garonne*, rejoices that "we have definitively left the sacral and baroque ages.... The great change has now been accomplished by virtue of which it is no longer human things that are charged with defending divine things, but divine things that offer themselves to defend human things"⁷⁰⁰ . "The stupidities of the past consisted of fundamentalism, a "misery", a "misery", a "misery", a "misery", a "misery", a "misery".

⁶⁹⁹ *Gaudium et Spes*, 43.

⁷⁰⁰ *Le Paysan de la Garonne*, p. 13.

spirit"⁷⁰¹ , which "dominated the last century and the first decades of this one"⁷⁰² . Until 1932, when the founding of the magazine *Esprit* in France and the *Catholic Worker* in the United States symbolically put an end to "the confusion and the coalescence, admitted for two centuries as natural, between the interests of religion and those of a class furiously attached to its interests"⁷⁰³ .

Integralism, says Maritain, originated in a more or less latent form of practical Manichaeism, in a distrust of human nature, which led to an undue superimposition of faith over reason, of the Church over the State, of the spirit over the flesh, and which led to guaranteeing the social order by the methods of force"⁷⁰⁴ .

But now, "the pendulum has suddenly swung to the opposite extreme of the almost Manichean contempt for the world professed in the Christian ghetto from which one was in the process of escaping"⁷⁰⁵ . The error of the modern Gnostics consists for Maritain in the opposite of fundamentalism: the distinction between the spiritual and the temporal is again denied⁷⁰⁶ , but not in the name of a misunderstood primacy of the spiritual, but of an erroneous primacy of the temporal. It is a complete temporalization of Christianity⁷⁰⁷ , in which the kingdom of God has no other reality but the world: "There is no kingdom of God distinct from the world, and ...the world reabsorbs into itself this kingdom: then is the world the kingdom of God..... There is no need to be saved from above, nor assumed and finally transfigured into Another world, a divine world. God, Christ, the Church, the sacraments, are immanent to the world"⁷⁰⁸ . On our knees, therefore, with Hegel and his followers before this illusory world; to it our faith, our hope, our love! We are Christians more than ever, since Christ is in him, since he is consubstantial to him"⁷⁰⁹ .

⁷⁰¹ Ibid., p. 35.

⁷⁰² Ibid., p. 237.

⁷⁰³ Ibid., p. 78.

⁷⁰⁴ Ibid., pp. 74-78.

⁷⁰⁵ Ibid., pp. 79 and 237.

⁷⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 89.

⁷⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 88.

⁷⁰⁸ Ibid., p. 94.

⁷⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 94.

Maritain, as can be seen, attacks fundamentalism, and makes him, in a certain way, responsible, by his practical Manichaeism, for provoking the opposite tendency of today's progressive neo-modernism, which, from contempt for the world, ends in its adoration. What is there of truth in Maritain's approach? First of all, it is necessary to establish that historical simplifications serve to prove anything. As Jean Madiran⁷¹⁰ has pointed out, in Maritain's approach "the interests of religion would have been confused, for two centuries, with those of *a* social class furiously adhered to its interests". But this is historically impossible. Because during these two centuries, from 1732 to 1932, there would have existed not *one*, but *several* social classes.

The privileged class of 1850 is not the same as the privileged class of 1750. In 1750, on the other hand, there were two privileged classes in the sense in which Maritain understands it (to tell the truth, there would be three). In 1850, the "privileged" of the first rank do not represent the same social categories as those of 1750: those of 1850 are, *roughly speaking*, those who have overthrown those of 1750 and taken their place, *with privileges of a different nature*.

"...In other words, are the social *facts* on which Maritain sets out to philosophize, exactly established facts, sufficiently analyzed, real facts?"⁷¹¹ .

In reality, Maritain's simplification leads him to a classist interpretation of religious history when it is evident that the situation of the Church in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries until 1932 - the date when, according to Maritain, the collusion of Catholicism with the bourgeoisie would have been broken - must be sought in the triumph of the secularist revolution, led by Freemasonry against the Church and which reached its climax in the famous revolution of 1789. The Church was then evicted from the public life of France and consequently confined to the "ghetto". No wonder then that Catholicism became "on the defensive" and became susceptible to the traumas of inferiority typical of organizations that seek only to defend themselves.

⁷¹⁰ *Itinéraires*, April 1967.

⁷¹¹ *Ibid.*

To understand this phenomenon, in a certain way inevitable, it is necessary to place oneself in the context of reality as it presents itself. At the time of the French Revolution, and already in the period of philosophism that was preparatory to it (the whole of the 18th century), and in the ensuing period - from the 19th century to the third decade of the 20th century - impiety completely took over the commanding positions of public life in France. Economy, politics and culture, everything is an instrument of power to expel the Church from life. What is the fate of Catholics in this situation? Either to accommodate themselves to it and enter into compromises with it, as was the case with the Masonic and Phileo-Sophist bishops and clerics of the eighteenth century and that of Lamennais and the liberals of the nineteenth century; or to put up a passive resistance to this hostile and impious world with the consequent diminutions that such an attitude can entail. In any case, this second position, which at least preserves the integrity of Christian faith and fortitude, is preferable to the other position of surrender and defection.

Does Maritain not notice when he places in 1932, with the appearance of *Esprit* in France and *Catholic Worker* in the United States, the closing of the fundamentalist period, that, precisely on that date, the neo-modernist period, against which he directs his most vivid attacks in *Le Paysan de la Garonne*, begins? Or does Maritain believe that these years of "Christians kneeling before the world"⁷¹² have been born by spontaneous generation and have not been prepared and promoted since 1932, when the Maritain-Mounier team execrated *sacred* Christianity and invented *lay* Christianity? What is the worship of the world today practiced by progressive theologians if not the augmented version of the integral Humanism with the dignity of the human person with which the whole Catholic environment of France and the World was invaded yesterday - three to four decades ago?

Maritain has no right to qualify as "Manichean" that fundamentalist Catholicism, since it was able to save the integrity of the Catholic faith and morals precisely because it took an attitude of defense against the impious world of Hegel, Marx and Freud.

On the other hand, his Catholicism of *Le Paysan de la Garonne* is Manichean, because, while it exalts the value of St. Thomas *on the speculative plane*, it totally ignores him on the practical plane of the temporal

life of the people.

⁷¹²*Le Paysan de la Garonne*, p. 88.

St. Thomas, in fact, values the traditional idea of the Catholic city accordingly. In his famous essay on *The Regiment of the Rulers*⁷¹³, he teaches that "the end of the multitude grouped in society consists in living according to virtue". That is, how he has to develop in the various treatises of his *Summa Theologica*, to adjust human coexistence to the prescriptions of the natural law that establishes the common good as the fundamental order of the political community. But St. Thomas must immediately add: "But since man, living according to virtue, is ordered to an ulterior end which consists in divine fruition, it is necessary that the ultimate end of the politically assembled multitude be to arrive by virtuous life at divine fruition". But the ministry in this last regime "has been entrusted to priests, and especially to the High Priest, the successor of Peter, the Vicar of Christ, the Roman Pontiff, to whom all the kings of the Christian people are to be subject as to the Lord Jesus Christ himself. For to him to whom belongs the care of the last end, those to whom belongs the care of the antecedent ends must be subject, and by his rule they must be directed".

St. Thomas proposes for all times as the only regime of complete health for the political man, that *sacred* Christianity of which Maritain abhors. The primacy of contemplation, which saves man in the speculative order, also saves him in the practical order of the social political order, because everything must be directed to the ultimate end of man, which consists in divine fruition. St. Thomas does not even hint at a rupture, like the one produced by Maritain, who after having filled pages and pages of his *Le Paysan d e l α Garonne* with disquisitions on the primacy of contemplation and on the necessity of fidelity to the Angelic Doctor, ends up handing over the whole temporal order and all "Christian politics" to social agitators like Saul Alinsky.

It is strange that Maritain, so eager to accumulate criticisms for the *sacred* Christianity that has filled sixteen centuries of the richest life of Christian Europe, a life whose remains continue to nourish the dwindling values that still maintain what remains healthy there, does not realize that the struggle he began, back in 1932, to take away the sacred character of Christianity, is now culminating in the work of progressive theologians who want to strip the sacredness from the very realities of worship and liturgy, which are in essence sacred. Fr. Daniélou says so.

⁷¹³ Book 1, ch. 15.

recently pointed out when he wrote⁷¹⁴ : "Against these sacred things a real iconoclastic fury is unleashed today. One would like to suppress churches or transform them into museums, to suppress religious feasts where one sees traces of paganism. Neither sacred place nor sacred time reserved for God. The desacralization of worship is well under way, the demystification of dogma will follow and the demystification of morals will be completed. At this moment, religion will have totally disappeared from visibility".

Daniélou's denunciation is not a mere alarm, as is clearly shown by the words of Paul VI, who on April 19 of the same year, said: "we are extremely distressed by the spread of a tendency to *desacralize*, as they dare to say, the liturgy, and with it, fatally, Christianity".

Le Paysan de la Garonne is an irrecusable testimony given by Maritain, one of the thinkers who have most strongly influenced Catholicism in this century, against the neo-modernist currents of today's theologians. The value of this testimony must be emphasized in all its significance.

But Maritain, who sees the seriousness of the present errors and who has the fortitude to denounce them with energy, does not succeed in recognizing the causes that have given rise to them. *Le Paysan de la Garonne* suffers from the fundamental incoherence that characterizes all Maritainian thought after 1930. The thought of *The Degrees of Knowledge*, where the sacred grandeur of contemplation is proposed for the speculative life, and the other thought, that of *Integral Humanism*, where the evangelical energies are appealed to for the construction of a secularized and desacralized temporal city.

⁷¹⁴ *Etudes, Religion and Civilization*, March 1967.

APPENDIX II

CONCILIAR DECLARATION ON RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AND TRADITIONAL DOCTRINE

Foreword

The recent conciliar Declaration on Religious Freedom raises a number of serious problems that concern philosophy and theology and therefore deserve careful consideration.

In the first place, and after a superficial reading, it would seem that the new conciliar Declaration of Vatican II modifies the traditional Catholic doctrine on the matter. However, this must be firmly excluded and rejected because it is excluded and rejected by the Declaration itself in its introductory part. We read there, in fact: "Finally, since the religious freedom which men demand in the fulfillment of their duty to worship God aims at immunity from coercion in civil society, it leaves intact the traditional Catholic doctrine on the moral obligation of men and societies towards the true religion and towards the one Church of Christ".

Even if the conciliar Declaration did not say anything in this regard, it would nevertheless be necessary to seek internal coherence between one doctrine and the other, since *a change and modification of the same* in such an important and vital point as the religious fact, would seriously question the assistance of the Holy Spirit to the magisterium of the Church and would also question the holiness of the Church itself, which for centuries would have acted by exercising norms completely contrary to those now sanctioned and which would be called into question by the permanent dignity of the human person.

Moreover, if this were so, the value of the new teaching and doctrine of the Conciliar Document would also be seriously questioned. For if the Church up to here, through the mouth of her ordinary magisterium, consistently taught a doctrine different from that which is now presented, what assurance can the Council give of its own inerrancy in the new doctrine if it denies the inerrancy of the previous twice-millennial teaching? Why should submission and inner compliance be attributed to the teaching proposed to us today by the Church if we are told that she was mistaken in the teaching of yesterday?

It is easy to list almost a hundred ecclesiastical documents which, unanimously, from the condemnation of the Encyclopedia in the Decree *Ut Primum* of Clement XIII, 3/9/1759, to the memorable allocution *Ci riesci* of 6/12/1953, of Pius XII, establish the traditional doctrine that denies *the right* to public profession of false cults and that grants the State the obligation and the right to repress them. This is precisely the point where the discrepancy between that traditional doctrine and the one now enunciated by the conciliar Declaration becomes more noticeable, which speaks explicitly of a right and a right founded on the dignity of the human person to the profession of false cults. Since the human person is a permanent and immutable value that subsists throughout the Christian centuries, will there not have been a violation of it in past centuries on the part of the Church if we accept the terms of the conciliar Declaration? For if it is true that the Church never accepted that anyone should be forced to embrace the Catholic religion against his will, as Leo XIII teaches in *Immortale Dei*, it is also true that she denied the right to the public profession of false cults and religious errors and maintained the obligation and the right of public authority to repress them whenever there were no superior reasons prescribing tolerance.

We are therefore, apparently at least, before two teachings that disagree. We would be making no progress if we were to say that the Church upheld the doctrine condemning false cults when she had public power and that she denies and rejects it now that she is deprived of it. For this would be to accuse her of *opportunism* in moral and juridical matters, which would result in a serious accusation against her magisterium and her sanctity.

We believe that the solution to the present problem is different. For one thing, there is no change of doctrine, although there may be a change in its formulation. The same doctrine receives two different formulations for two different historical situations. We will deal with this in more detail in the present study.

Someone will think that the conciliar Declaration of Vatican II comes to confirm the positions that years ago Jacques Maritain defended so brilliantly in his *Integral Humanism* and that were strongly censured in my book *From Lamennais to Maritain*. We do not believe it. Because Maritain's position, like that of Lamennais, its true inventor, as well as that of all Catholic liberalism so strongly censured in the documents of Gregory XVI, Pius IX and Leo XIII, is based on a progressive conception of history and of man; progress that would determine the acquisition of *new* rights that would correspond to the new state of man's adulthood and that could not be granted to him in those centuries of infancy and immaturity.

On the other hand, Maritain qualifies as "inviolable natural" the right that the human person would have "before the State, the temporal community and the temporal power to choose his religious path at his risks and dangers" (*Les Droits*, p. 103), which gives it a character that goes beyond the *secondary and conditioned* nature of this right in the conciliar Declaration.

In addition, Maritain insists on characterizing and qualifying as "New Christianity" and "vitally Christian society" a society that would not reach the characteristics of "theistic" and that should rather be considered agnostic, if not openly atheistic and materialistic.

Because the problem with Maritain does not lie in the recognition of the *fact* that today, the traditional doctrine that emphasized the rights of religious truth is not applicable, and it is only applicable, and must still be applied by political Prudence, the one that emphasizes freedom. The problem lies in the philosophy of values and history that founds and explains this *new fact* that determines the application of *new rights*. The modern man who claims *freedom*, does it mean, in itself and absolutely, *simpliciter* in scholastic language, a progress over the man of Christendom, who claims *the truth*? Or, instead, is it a

Is the change in the formulation of the doctrine of religious freedom imposed today by the Second Vatican Council required by *a truly human progress* that has taken place in man or, on the contrary, is it required by a true return?

It is clear that, in determining this problem, we must start from the text and context of the conciliar Declaration, examining it in the light of the whole secular doctrine of the Church herself, without any interest in the particular opinion that the Council Fathers may have held on the matter; because the truly conciliar act, as an act of the Church, and one that merits the assistance of the Holy Spirit, is the text in its full objective formulation, approved by the definitive act of the conciliar Assembly and of the Sovereign Pontiff.

It is also clear that the authentic interpretation of the Conciliar Declaration is to be given by the magisterium of the Roman Chair, to which all Christians owe full respect.

Feast of St. John Bosco 1966.

The fact of religious freedom today

The conciliar Declaration on Religious Liberty begins by situating itself in a *fact*, which is given *hac nostra aetate*, in this our age. This fact is that men are becoming more and more conscious of their dignity as human persons and that the number of those who demand that in their actions men should enjoy and use their own counsel and freedom, not moved by force but guided by the conscience of duty, is increasing. They also call for the juridical limitation of public power so that the limits of the honest freedom of both individuals and associations are not excessively circumscribed.

This fact alluded to in the conciliar Declaration would not suffice to legitimize a new juridical condition if it were not accompanied by other circumstances that highlight and bring to the forefront this desire for freedom. For there has always been and always will be a desire for freedom. But in other times, when the sense of Truth and virtue dominated, the desire for freedom was conditioned by that sense and subordinated to it. Today, on the other hand, when societies suffer from intellectual anarchy, especially in religious matters, men seek freedom and only freedom to determine themselves more and more by what seems best to them. Moreover, in the past, when man found himself in truth and in human truth, which satisfied the scope of his aspirations, his yearning for freedom had a peaceful and normal character, whereas today, when man feels himself pushed and predestined towards the servitude of the machine society, he also feels within himself this yearning for freedom, a freedom which in a certain sense is distant from his effective realizations. Faced with the threat of a civilization of automatic mechanisms that would control things and men, it is urgent to save as much as possible the freedom of the human person, especially in religious matters. The Council Declaration expressly alludes to the threat of our times -*nostrae aetatis*-, to the loss of freedom.

This fact, from which the Conciliar Declaration takes its point of departure, must be sufficiently emphasized in order to understand the nature and scope of the new juridical regime it proposes for the historical situation of man today. For this historical situation, the only one that is given to us today as possible, is the one that determines the abandonment of that other juridical regime which, although good in itself, is no longer possible in its application, and which legitimizes the juridical regime of religious freedom, sanctioned by

the Council. Let it be understood, however, that it is not the new fact, nor the new historical situation that constitutes the new right. For if this were so, we would be in full opportunism and we would give the value of law to the accomplished fact, but rather, as new and unprecedented situations arise, rights prevail which were found before, but which were dominated by superior rights, and the latter cease to act in the face of the impossibility that is presented to them in the new historical situation. It should also be understood that these rights that prevail over those that lose their validity must be *secondary and conditional* rights of the human person. For if they were *primary and absolute*, as, for example, that no one can be forced to commit a sin, they would have to be considered immutable and permanent for any historical situation and, therefore, in continuous force in all circumstances.

The obligation to profess the true religion

After having emphasized the new fact and the new historical situation within which he is going to propose to the Conciliar Declaration his doctrine on religious freedom, he goes on to establish the obligation incumbent upon every man to seek objective truth, and once known, to embrace and follow it; objective truth which God has made known to the whole human race and which is to be found in the Catholic and Apostolic Church, which has been given the mandate to go and preach to all peoples.

By emphasizing this obligation to *an objective religious truth*, the Conciliar Declaration closes the way to all religious indifferentism. Man is obliged to seek and follow the truth that the Church teaches. And this is by command of Christ, who as a Divine Legacy made himself present to humanity to reveal to it the will of God.

This fundamental obligation which weighs upon human persons simultaneously implies in it a *primary and absolute* right, in the face of any human power, to follow and profess the Catholic truth. For it is the obligation before God that founds the right before men. And the right to follow the Catholic truth does not have the same force or the same juridical value that man can invoke to follow, even in good faith, religious error. This may be a derived, secondary and conditioned right. The former is a primary and absolute right. Man has only an absolute and unconditional right to the living and true God, who

Jesus Christ has revealed to us. For only the objective truth of this God calms all human aspirations and desires as an end. The end of man is the Truth of God. Man was created to know, love and serve God, says the catechism with simplicity and depth.

But man must arrive at this truth of God through his freedom. And the Council says that "these obligations (to follow the truth) touch and bind the conscience of men, but that the truth does not impose itself except by force of the truth itself, which penetrates the mind in a way that is at the same time gentle and strong". If man has the right to truth and if truth is *freely* arrived at, man has the right to freedom. But he has a right to the extent that he seeks the truth and is ordered to it. The right to truth is superior to the right to freedom. Because the former founds the latter, which is not to be applied except to the extent that the former founding right requires it. If the right to truth is *primary and absolute*, the right to freedom is neither so primary nor so absolute. But, nevertheless, the freedom to follow the religious truth, in private and in public, is a *primary and absolute* right. So far, this is the unanimous and constant Catholic doctrine before and after Vatican II. The right of freedom to the true religion maintains its force before God and men.

The right to follow false cults in traditional doctrine and in the Conciliar Declaration

The difficulty begins with the question of the right to the profession of false cults and, consequently, with the obligation and duty of the State to repress them in the orbit of public law.

The traditional doctrine in this matter is magnificently expounded by Leo XIII in two famous and well-known documents: *La Immortale Dei* of November 1, 1885 and *Libertas proestantissimum* of June 20, 1891. There Leo XIII condemns the principles of the so-called new right that considers all religions equal, which leads to atheism, and also condemns freedom of conscience in the false sense, while defending freedom of conscience to obey God. However, Leo XIII expressly states that the Church does not condemn heads of state who, in virtue of a good to be achieved or of an evil to be achieved, condemn freedom of conscience in a false sense, while defending the freedom of conscience to obey God.

to prevent, they tolerate that in practice these various cults each have their place in the State. He also points out the universal custom of the Church to take great care that no one be forced to embrace the Catholic faith against his will, for, as St. Augustine warns: "Man cannot believe except of his own free will. Leo XIII also points out that the principle of toleration is not to be abused, but is to be applied to the extent required by the common good.

It is easy to see that in traditional doctrine there is no mention of *law* except for truth and goodness. With respect to falsehood and evil we speak of *tolerance*, which belongs to the *civil* sphere, in which the State or public power has to allow, as advised by political prudence in the various circumstances, a greater or lesser circulation of falsehood and evil, in view of the greater common good.

The Conciliar Declaration on Religious Freedom speaks, instead, of the right of the human person and of communities to *social and civil* freedom in religious matters and denies the right of the State to intervene to force the profession of a cult, even if it is the true one, or to repress that of others, even if they are false.

As is easy to see, the Conciliar Declaration places itself on the civil level of rights. No speaks of the level of conscience vis-à-vis God, because it has already considered it in the introduction and there it has recognized only rights to objective religious truth.

How does the Conciliar Declaration found this right to freedom, even for error, and this not only for the conscience of good faith but also for that of bad faith? It founds them by saying that "the exercise of religion, by its very nature, consists primarily in voluntary and free internal acts, by which man orders himself directly to God: and such acts cannot be commanded or forbidden by a purely human power." This, as can be seen, with regard to the *private* profession of false cults. But the conciliar Declaration also justifies the right of the human person to the *public* profession of these same cults and thus adds that: "The very social nature of man demands that he should express outwardly the internal acts of religion, that he should communicate with others in religious matters and profess his religion in a communal manner". And lest anyone think that this is limited to the private and public profession of erroneous cults practiced in good faith, when the Conciliar Declaration states the nature of the psychological act of seeking the truth

The right to religious freedom is founded not on the subjective disposition of the person but on his very nature", he adds. And then he expresses: "Therefore the right to this immunity perseveres even in those who do not satisfy the obligation to seek the truth and to adhere to it; its exercise cannot be impeded as long as the just public order is respected".

Consequently, the conciliar Declaration upholds the *civil* right of the human person to the profession, even in bad faith, of false cults, and denies the *civil* right of the State to repress them or to force the public profession of true worship.

From this it is clear how the two formulations agree and how they differ. Placed in a *historical situation* in which the public good makes it impossible to repress false cults, the one, the traditional one, speaks only of tolerance; the other, that of the Conciliar Declaration, speaks of the rights of the human person.

Are we facing a new doctrine that changes the previous one?

This is the first question that arises when studying one and the other doctrinal exposition. Is this, the Conciliar Declaration, a new doctrine that changes the previously held doctrine, or is it the same doctrine, with a new formulation, that leaves the previous doctrine standing? The answer nos given by the Conciliar Declaration itself, which expressly states in one of its first paragraphs that "the religious freedom which men demand in the fulfillment of their duty to worship God *leaves intact the traditional Catholic doctrine on the moral duty of man and society towards the true religion and towards the one Church of Christ*".

The concordance between one and the other doctrine is to be sought in the point that, *given the current historical situation that makes the repression of false cults and public support for the true one impossible*, that is, given that the situation of the principle of tolerance, of which Leo XIII spoke, has become *institutionalized*, it is necessary to start from this situation in the *civil* order, and to recognize rights to the profession immune from coercion of the religious act; rights that existed previously because they are linked to the nature of the religious act, but that could not be actualized because of the prevalence of superior rights, which were those of the public power to enforce the respect of the religious act.

The rights of religious truth; a right of the public power that has lapsed due to the evolution of *civil* society and the defection of the public power itself, which, as we shall see below, has declined its religious function and has become a purely material power with only material ends.

This doctrine of the expiration of a juridical regime and the validity of a new one implies that these are *secondary* rights of the human person. And, in effect, the right to the public profession of religious error is a right derived from that absolute and primary one that only grants the right to the truth.

Per se, per se, there can only be a right to the truth. This is a *primary and absolute* right. But since freedom to the truth becomes very risky and impossible in religious matters, which per se belong to the internal forum of conscience, if one does not also grant it the right to err, one must recognize in the human person, *per accidens*, that is, for a circumstantial and derived reason, a right to error. This right is, therefore, *secondary, derived and conditioned*.

And in turn, the obligation and, consequently, the right of the State to impose protection of the public right to religious truth depends on the fundamental and primary right, which is that of the common good that is the very end of society and of civil authority. If human persons have the right to religious truth, as a *primary and absolute* right, they also have, before other persons, the right not to be induced into error or diverted from the truth. Above all, this right becomes all the more imperative when it concerns the simple and ignorant people. Then, the protection of the right to religious truth belongs to the public power, which cannot be achieved except by repression of the public profession of religious errors. This right is also *secondary and derivative*.

The right to public freedom to religious error can enter in conflict with the right of the public Power to the protection of the religious truth. They are very clear and evident, and in such a case the Prudence and the political Prudence will have to decide in the diverse circumstances which right has to prevail.

Having made these clarifications, the question is: how can the same doctrine be the one that grants a right based on human dignity and the other, the traditional one, which did not grant a right, but only tolerated, *for reasons of the good of the human person*, the right of the human being, and the other, the traditional

one, which did not grant a right, but only tolerated, for *reasons of the good of the human person*?

If the answer is that man's relationship to God includes two essential elements in *the dignity* of the human person. The first is that man moves towards the end, which is the objective truth of God himself; and the second is that he moves by himself, by the truth of his conscience, without any external coercion. Two elements, one that looks to the end, the truth of the human person; and the other, that looks to the means, the freedom of the human person. Speaking *absolutely*, man has the obligation to move toward God, and only toward God. From this obligation arises the *right* vis-à-vis his fellow human beings not to coerce him or prevent him from moving freely toward God. That is to say, he has *an absolute and primary right* to move freely toward the true religion, which alone communicates him with his end. In this respect, Truth alone has an *absolute* right, which error cannot have. For although the human person is the subject of rights, the title or reason which confers this right is truth and not error. Standing on this absolute point, the traditional doctrine accorded man no right but only and only to practice the true religion. It allowed, as a *lesser evil*, that it was preferable to tolerate the private and public practice of false cults. It also held as a duty of the Public Power this *tolerance* of false cults. *This obligation* - relative - of the Public Power, determined by reasons of political prudence, created, in a certain way, *a right* also relative in the citizens to practice any cult, true or false. A purely *civil* right, that is to say, with validity in the sphere of civility, but not in that of morality.

There is no doubt that this exposition and formulation of doctrine is *perfect* and the conciliar Declaration of Vatican II expresses that it should be maintained. But it is possible to take as a starting point not an absolute consideration but a relative one, namely, *the historical situation in which man finds himself today in the face of the practice of many religions in the same civil society*, and to establish in these conditions the relative or *conditional right-civil* right-which corresponds to each man and to each religious community to profess privately and publicly any cult. It is clear that this consideration, although legitimate, must also be considered imperfect if it is compared with the traditional consideration set forth by the Church from the *Mirari Vos* of Gregory XVI to the *Libertas* of Leo XIII, an exposition to which the Church has conformed up to now in official documents. Imperfect consideration because, instead of considering the *civil juridical* order as being in continuity with the sphere of morality and forming a part of it, it introduces in a certain way a kind of

separation between civility and morality, which implies a certain dehumanization or amoralization of the State or civil society.

Therefore, a *change* has taken place, not in the profession of doctrine but in its formulation. Hence the importance of this introduction to Religious Liberty proposed to us by the conciliar Declaration of Vatican II must be emphasized.

Is the change in the formulation of the doctrine desirable?

Is this change in the formulation of doctrine desirable or not? We understand that this question may merit several answers, depending on the point of view from which one looks at things. First of all, there is God's point of view, which from all eternity has fixed the plan of history. And in this sense, although what happens does not have to be *absolutely the best*, since God is free in his determinations and is not obliged to choose the best, nevertheless, it must be considered the best, inasmuch as it must be, in the final analysis, the fulfillment of his will, at least permissive and consistent.

In this regard, we must say that, since the Church of Jesus Christ is under the special guidance of the Holy Spirit, a change in the *formulation* of a doctrine so vital to the very essence of the religious act, and a change in a tradition that is twice a millennium old, would seem to signify singular designs of God for the times in which we live and for those that are approaching. These singular designs could be linked to apocalyptic events, which could culminate in what St. Paul calls *Plenitudo Gentium* (Rom. 11:25), the entry of peoples into the bosom of the Church in fullness, a free and loving entry; or also in the approach of what the same Apostle calls *the universal apostasy* (2 Thess. 2:3). Whatever the case may be, we must always bear in mind that history, and especially the history of the Church, moves along mysterious paths that only God alone knows and leads.

For this reason, leaving aside the point of view of God, which escapes us by no means, we must limit ourselves to the hypotheses possible from a purely human point of view, even if we take into account the data of Divine Revelation.

From a purely human point of view, we have to say that, by formulating in an imperfect expression the traditional doctrine, the Church fulfills *an act of mercy* for the man of today. A mature and healthy man is not treated in the same way as a sick person. The same treatment is not given to a man - or to a civilization - that moves *in truth* as to one who, having lost the sense of truth, moves in the idea of *freedom*. Man today does not know where the truth is or how to find it. He only demands freedom. But man, far from the truth, is a sick man, who does not even have freedom. For only the truth makes us free (John, 8, 32).

Hence, it would be a grave error to take this act of mercy of the Church in the conciliar Declaration on Religious Liberty as an argument of the maturity of man today. Today's man may have made much progress in partial aspects of his existence. But with regard to his estrangement from the Catholic Church, which goes hand in hand with his estrangement from Christ and God, he is suffering a terrible crisis and illness that affects the essence of his existence. For he is moving away from Christ who has been given to him as Salvation, from Christ, who is the truth of his understanding and the Grace of his Will. And, by losing the good of the fundamental part of his being, the man of today becomes incapable of making good use of the partial progress he would have made in many aspects of his activity.

From an erroneous appreciation of the meaning of the conciliar act can follow an equally erroneous attitude with regard to the orientation to be attributed to the whole of man's life. For if the new formulation is taken as an act of mercy on the part of the Church in view of the sickness that afflicts man today, who prefers freedom to truth, it must be concluded that, starting from freedom, towards which the vital desires of man today are directed, he must move towards the acquisition of Truth, because it alone will save him. If, on the other hand, the new formulation, on the basis of freedom, is taken as an act to which the Church has been forced in order to satisfy the maturity that the man of today has reached in his estrangement from the Church herself, one would have to conclude that it will be necessary to accelerate this march on the path of freedom, even if it determines a greater religious estrangement of man from the Church and from God. For if freedom, and not precisely the truth, saves him, it will always be necessary to orient oneself on a path of greater freedom.

This makes us see the importance of the just appreciation of the conciliar act, which would be mistaken and even harmful, if it were taken as a measure to be adopted *against* the doctrine and the previous practice of two thousand years of Church; when in reality it is taken as a *starting point*, in attention to the sickly state of the present man, to lead him from here to the enjoyment of the perfect health that can only be found in the full profession of the whole doctrine. This imperfection of a regime of freedom as opposed to that of truth does not prevent that there can be true progress in freedom if it is not carried out *against* truth but within it. The *modern* regime of freedom is precisely bad because it has been erected against truth. But if the full right of truth, and of religious truth in human life, is maintained, there is no doubt that the more this right of truth is realized in a climate of freedom, the more perfect it must be considered.

These considerations show us how behind the conciliar act on Religious Freedom there moves a whole Theology of History, which can be formulated in correct or wrong terms. In correct terms if we take as a criterion for man's salvation, even on the temporal level, his approach to the Church, the Universal Sacrament of Health; or, in wrong terms, if we adopt any other value. For if the first criterion is adopted, it must be concluded that the *modern* world, insofar as it sets up as man's salvation other values than those set up by Christian civilization, is *losing* man, no matter how many and how great are the acquisitions that it can offer him on the material plane. On the contrary, the greater these acquisitions are, if they are not accompanied by the authentic spiritual energy with which the Church heals and strengthens man, the greater will be the catastrophe into which they will lead.

From all this we must conclude that Religious Liberty, which the Church proposes to us in the Conciliar Declaration, has a sense diametrically opposed to that which the secular enemies of the Church proclaim up to this point. For them, religious freedom is an end in itself that serves to distance us from the Truth. In the Conciliar Declaration, on the other hand, freedom is a simple means, of special significance in the state of health of man today, which must be adopted in view of the end, which is to bring man to health, which can only be found in Catholic Truth.

The importance of these reflections must be measured by taking into account the power that the enemies of the Church enjoy in the field of communications, and which they will undoubtedly use to distort the right sense and meaning of the conciliar act. For them, the change in the formulation of the traditional doctrine must be interpreted as a victory of Masonic enlightenment, which has finally succeeded in imposing itself even within the Church over intolerant reactionarism. Unfortunately, these enemies are to find powerful support in theological theories which have been influenced by the liberalism of the last century after the bold conceptions of Lamennais and his numerous followers. There is a danger that organized propaganda, carried out at all levels of human mentality, will interpret the Religious Freedom of Vatican II as an expression of the currents of religious indifferentism and thus serve to increase the number of those who, confused by the multitude of beliefs and opinions in the religious field, end up in the ever-increasing army of the godless.

Although we point out these very real dangers, we nevertheless harbor the confidence that the Church's act of mercy demonstrated at Vatican II can in turn move the hearts of "men of good will" and arouse a current of conversions. For if it is true that atheism is increasing in a world in which public life is becoming more secularized, it is also true that in this world that is disintegrating and atomizing, the millions of people who experience in their hearts and minds the call of God feel more and more strongly drawn to the Catholic Church, where faith in the living and true God remains intact. What is essential is that Catholics, far from indulging in the foolish adventure of wanting to liquidate the treasure of theology and spirituality of their two thousand years of Christian life, deepen this treasure and make it bear fruit in forms yet unpublished of a truth that, in communicating with God, is above all time and all history. The new must be linked to the tradition of the past. For if the teaching of the twentieth century disavows what was taught in the nineteenth century, it condemns itself, because it has just as much right to be disavowed in the twenty-first century. It is to be hoped that the adventure of Christian Progressivism, which has taken such a strong hold on many Catholic nuclei

and that can prosper with a false interpretation of the conciliar acts, leaving room for more sensible and legitimate manifestations of religious renewal.

The dignity of the human person and religious freedom

In paragraph 2, the Second Vatican Council declares that "the human person has the right to religious freedom". And it goes on to state what this freedom consists in. "It consists, it says, that all men should be immune from coercion on the part of particular men and on the part of social groups and of any human power, so that in religious matters no one should be coerced to act against his conscience, nor should he be prevented from acting according to his conscience, whether privately or publicly, alone or in association with others, within due limits".

The Council goes on to point out that this right to freedom refers "to seek religious truth" and, once known, "to adhere to it and to order one's whole life according to the demands of the same truth. But it warns something that is very important and says: "For this reason the right to this immunity perseveres even in those who do not satisfy the obligation to seek the truth and to adhere to it; for which reason its exercise cannot be impeded as long as just public order is preserved".

Rights based on the dignity of the human person. Man has rights because he has obligations. The obligation founds the right. Obligations come from his character of intelligent and free rational creature. As an intelligent and free creature he has dominion over his acts and as a creature he is obliged to carry out his acts in accordance with the will and disposition of the Creator. Man has the fundamental obligation to order his whole life toward his Creator. His life must be religious in that manner and way in which his Creator has made it known to him, in case there is a positive religion imposed by the Creator. Man has an obligation to adhere to this truth and to conform his whole life in accordance with it. This is an inescapable obligation of his being and its fulfillment in itself dignifies his character as a person. For the human person is dignified when he attains the end that perfects him. And this end is God in religious Truth.

From this obligation, fundamental and first because of its ontological importance, are born the rights that man has before another man. Because he has an obligation under his responsibility to reach God, he has the right that every man or human group neither coerce him to follow a religious path different from Truth nor prevent him from following that determined one which leads him to Truth. Man has a right *first of all* to religious Truth. And because he has a right to religious truth he has a right also, *in the second place*, to religious freedom.

The right to religious freedom is *in itself and in absolute terms* a function of religious truth. Man does not have a right, *in itself and in absolute, unconditioned*, but only to the freedom that leads him to religious truth and insofar as it leads him to this truth. This does not mean that *internal* religious acts that do not lead to religious truth can be forced. For these, being *internal*, cannot fall under the jurisdiction of any power on earth, which is only external and in what is in any way of the public forum. Religious *external* acts can be *of themselves and in general* forced. For the Public Power may prescribe the commission of certain acts or proscribe others. This power of jurisdiction that belongs to the State over the *external* religious acts of the citizens is *conditioned and modified* in the world since the presence of the Church of Jesus Christ. Modified in the sense that the State cannot exercise it except under the jurisdiction of the Church, which has received power over religious matters from Jesus Christ himself. And so the Church has prescribed in all its legislation and practice that neither Jews nor pagans should be forced. With respect to Christians, the State, under the authorization of the Church, could in times past legitimately force heretics and apostates to fulfill the commitments they made in baptism. This, which was legitimate in the Christian ages, is no longer so with the new conciliar Declaration on "Religious Liberty", in which the Church prescribes that the Civil Power has no jurisdiction over religious acts, except for what refers to just public order.

Is it a new doctrine that men cannot be forced in their religious life? It is not new with respect to Jews and pagans, except for some exceptions that cannot be imputed to the Church as such. For this, suffice it to recall the clear and categorical teaching of St. Thomas, who denies that Jews and pagans can be coerced to embrace the faith, although he considers it licit that if they can be repressed, they can be forced to embrace the faith, and that they cannot be forced to embrace the faith.

If the one who adulterates the coin is punished, it is all the more necessary that the one who perverts and adulterates the Catholic faith be punished, even with penalties (*Summa*, 2-2, 10, 8).

This new doctrine, therefore, with respect to heretics and apostates, establishes new norms for the States than those which were once in force. This means that with the conciliar act the Church officially sanctions the right which the States enjoyed with respect to *external* religious acts and provides that, henceforth, they cannot exercise any jurisdiction not only over Jews and pagans, but also over Christians. Accordingly, the religious acts of all men by sanction of the universal religious Power

-The Roman Catholic Church, except with regard to just public order, is removed from the power and jurisdiction of the civil States, which can no longer exercise any kind of violence against them.

Is there any reason for the Church to adopt this *new* norm today *with regard* to Christians? Undoubtedly there is, and it consists *in the greater sensitivity* of modern man with regard to *freedom*, whereas man in the past was more sensitive to the rights of *truth*. This greater sensitivity of modern man to freedom could have been actualized by maintaining the sense of truth. But it has been actualized *against* truth. Hence there is no substantial *human* progress but a fall and a return. Modern man, in fact, has lost the sense of the value of truth and religious unity and the sense of the gravity of the sins that directly attack this truth and unity.

Does this loss of the sense of religious truth and this increase in the sense of freedom signify progress with respect to the man of before or rather a return? We have dealt with this question above and its solution depends on what we have said above. It is clear that the right to freedom is secondary and has reason of means with respect to the right that man has to religious truth. For religious truth has reason as an end. Man is made for God. Therefore God is the end of man. If man were made for himself, his freedom would have reason as an end. Man would be dignified *primarily* by the exercise of his freedom. But if man is made for another, his dignity is attained *primarily to* the extent that he conforms to this other for whose end he is made. This does not mean that freedom does not *constitute* man's dignity. It only shows that it is not his

first constitutive dignity, and that if it is done *against* the truth, it implies a fall and a loss.

An order of civilization that takes into account the rights of religious truth as the first dignity of man is to be considered superior to an order that takes into account as first dignity the mere rights of freedom. Hence the secular order of Christianity which paid homage to the rights of the truth of man is to be considered superior to the order of modern life which considers above all and first of all the rights of freedom.

So we must not hesitate to answer the question posed and reply that the path of an order of civilization which, from the recognition and esteem of the rights of truth, has passed to another order which, postponing that recognition and esteem, has been moved only by the rights of freedom, signifies a decline and a return of the essence of man. For if man is fulfilled, fulfilled and dignified *at all - simpliciter* - only when he achieves the end for which he was created, that other dignification that he achieves in his freedom or in any other value, outside the essential one, dignifies him only *partially and in one aspect, secundum quid*, to speak in terms of the School.

This more imperfect order of civilization determines and founds *new* rights, but also more imperfect if compared with the law of that civilization that moved by the force of truth.

The fact that it is more imperfect does not mean that this right to religious freedom does not have its foundation, as the Conciliar Declaration says, "*in* the dignity of the person, whose requirements have been made more fully known by the experience of the centuries," in itself, or considered not precisely in relation to the dignity conferred by the truth. If this religious liberty had progressed by maintaining the forces of truth, then it could be considered as a progress and a substantial perfection.

Consequently, the right to religious freedom, even if it is knowingly and conscientiously exercised in errors and false cults, is a right of the human person, neither absolute nor first, but only *conditional*, determined by a *historical* situation that may justify the

foundation of a truly *new* law. Just as one does not administer to a sick man the same dietary regime to which a healthy man is entitled, so one cannot dispense the same juridical regime to the man of a civilization who is moved by the rights of truth and to one who is moved only by those of liberty.

If freedom rests on the dignity of nature of the human person, did not an order of civilization that forced that freedom violate that dignity? This question has been sufficiently clarified in explaining how the dignity of the human person which implies religious freedom in the external order of life to the profession of false cults is not to be considered as absolute or primary but conditioned and secondary to that other dignity which rests on man's adjustment to his truth. We have here two dignities of the human person, the one absolute and primary, since it alone dignifies him by constituting his proper and essential end; and the other, conditioned and secondary in function of that absolute and primary one. These two dignities, with the rights that one and the other imply, can come into conflict. The right of the Christian State to maintain in the public order the Christian truth can be in conflict with the freedom of the citizen to profess errors and false cults. The right and obligation of the Christian State to ensure the protection of citizens to their religious truth may conflict with the right of other citizens to profess religious error. If the State has the obligation to protect its citizens against those who adulterate coins or any other merchandise,

Should it not also be against those who adulterate the religious truth that makes the very end of man? The answer is self-evident, as long as there is the condition of a society where the common man understands where religious truth is and what is its *primary* importance among all the values of life. If for any historical circumstance man becomes incapable of understanding the rights and demands of religious truth and loses the sense of the hierarchy of values and rights, he *changes in a certain way in his fundamental moral and juridical nature*, at least in his secondary rights, to give place to the foundation of other rights condicionado, relative and derived from his new historical situation. Analogically, what happens to man in his historical condition of original sin, who must live in a regime of

private ownership of goods, which, as St. Thomas teaches, was not to be realized if it had maintained the original justice, since it would then have known a perfect community of goods and services. A different historical situation, which far from being one of progress in the case of its sensitivity to freedom *against* truth, can be one of sickness and ruin, determines new rights adapted to that new situation.

It is clear that *the change* of rights is verified with respect to secondary rights of the human person, which are the *civil* rights of protection or freedom from religious truth or falsehood.

The State, as the custodian of just public order, can enforce religious freedom in the conciliar Declaration.

That the public authority has the right to intervene in the religious sphere is clearly demonstrated by the fact that in the same conciliar Declaration on religious freedom it has not been possible to exclude all intervention. Because there are cases in which some citizens, invoking religious freedom, could practice acts directly violating absolute and primary rights of other citizens, such as the rights to life, to honor and to other human goods; and it is logical that the State, custodian of human rights, has the right and the obligation to exercise the corresponding protection and guardianship of the same. Hence the Conciliar Declaration points out the attribution and the right of civil society to "protect itself against abuses that can be committed under the pretext of religious freedom, and how, above all, the protection of this freedom belongs to the civil power; This is not to be done arbitrarily or with favoritism, but according to juridical norms in conformity with the objective moral order, which are required for the effective protection of the rights of all citizens and for their peaceful coexistence and for the sufficient promotion of the healthy political peace that is ordered coexistence in true justice, and for the due protection of public morality". From here it is easy to make an argument in defense of the medieval civilization that understood that in "just public order" it was necessary to include the rights to the public protection of religious truth against the various adulterators who, under the invocation of

news on order of thought and of life, they should have pretended to modify the deposit of truths given by God to man.

More on the nature of religious freedom

In paragraph 3 of the Conciliar Declaration, the moral process of the religious act is clarified at length. It is established there first of all that there is a supreme norm of human life and that this consists in the divine, eternal, objective and universal law, by which God, in the counsel of his wisdom and love, orders, directs and governs the universe, the world and the ways of the human community. Man must conform to this rule and norm, so that he has the obligation and the right to seek the truth as far as religion is concerned, and to this end he must employ suitable means to arrive, through his moral conscience, at the acquisition of objective religious truth. From here it appears splendidly how the objective truth of the divine law founds the first, absolute and unconditioned right of religious truth and religious freedom.

Consequently then, and always in function of this objective religious truth, comes also the absolute and unconditioned right, although not so first, to decide *freely*, without coercion of any human power and moved only by the objective force of the truth, also objective, to this religious truth.

But this inquisitive process of searching for truth in human practice becomes very difficult and does not always, even if it is done with the greatest good faith, assure us of a successful outcome. It may end in a purely subjective truth, which in the eyes of the moral conscience appears to be the truth, but which in reality is not the truth but an error. What right then has man to be respected in the profession, especially public, of that error? He can invoke a right, because if he has to decide for religious truth freely and cannot do so with that freedom without running the risk of error and invincible error, it is clear that a certain right to religious error must be recognized. But this right cannot be absolute and unconditioned, because it does not depend *directly* on objective religious truth, nor is it directly suspended from it. Only the movement of religious freedom is absolute and unconditioned, which leads to the right to religious error.

effectively to religious truth, because it is this truth that founds the subsequent rights of freedom.

Directly and as such, it has no right to the profession of religious error. But in view of the nature of the inquisitorial process of religious truth, which in its complexity cannot fail to run the risk of error, especially in a society that is increasingly confused about religious truth, it must be maintained that *indirectly and accidentally, indirectly and per accidens*, a right founded on the human person to religious error must be recognized.

This right to freedom from religious error can enter into collision con the rights that other human persons have not to be infected with religious error. It is clear that in this collision of rights it is possible to give primacy to the rights of religious truth over those of freedom or, on the contrary, to those of freedom over those of truth. Better a *human historical situation* that allows to give primacy to the rights of truth, since this founds the rights of freedom from religious error. But if *in fact* this is not possible because religious error has reached enormous diffusion, there is no alternative but to recognize as *first and prior* in fact the rights of freedom even to religious error. And then a *civil* public law arises, *conditioned* to a human historical situation, which gives primacy to the rights of religious error over those of religious truth.

Up to this point we have considered the case of freedom to religious error in good faith conscience. But it is clear that this freedom must be extended indistinctly to any religious error, either because of the difficulty of demonstrating good or bad faith, or because of the insensitivity that has formed in current public opinion to appreciate the seriousness of religious error in general. For this reason, the Second Vatican Council expressly establishes that religious freedom being a right of the human person, a right which can be misused, "perseveres even in those who do not satisfy the obligation to seek the truth or to adhere to it; and that its exercise cannot be impeded as long as it does not disturb the just public order".

Here the Council establishes a practical norm suited to the present historical situation which, as we have already repeated, has become sensitive to the rights of freedom over those of truth. It is clear that this right sanctioned by the Council, even for those who in bad faith publicly profess religious errors, has an

The foundation in the human person is even more remote and conditioned than that enjoyed by those who err in good faith. Just as these, those who err in good faith, enjoy a *secondary and conditional* right con respect to the *absolute and unconditional right* of those who demand freedom for the profession of religious truth.

The State and religious freedom

The conciliar Declaration on "Religious Freedom" repeatedly insists that this freedom consists in immunity from coercion on the part of the civil authority, which must neither force citizens in favor of any particular religion nor prevent them from professing the religion of their choice. The conciliar Declaration would seem, therefore, to lean toward strict religious neutrality. This creates a special problem, namely, whether it should continue to maintain, as it has done up to now, that the State should, with its coercive power, in some way assist religious truth. The Conciliar Declaration has in this regard in paragraph 3 a few words that deserve special consideration. There we read:

"Moreover, religious acts, by which men address God privately and publicly according to the opinion of their conscience, transcend by their nature the earthly and temporal order; the civil Power, whose proper end is to procure the temporal common good, must recognize and favor the religious life of citizens, but it would overstep its bounds if it were to seek to direct or impede religious acts."

The elucidation of the present problem will require the development of several propositions:

a) *The State and, in general, public life cannot fail to influence by favoring or hindering religious freedom and even religious truth. Hence there is strictly no religious neutrality.* The State is a universal cause which has great influence on the public life of a people and, through public life, on private life. Because the State has the political power, which makes the legislation, administration and justice of a country. Therefore, the State manages important elements of the economy, law and culture, all of which shape the mentality of citizens and create habits of thought and behavior. No matter how much the State depersonalizes and mechanizes itself, it must necessarily manage elements that contribute to the

humanization and dehumanization of man. Elements that, in one way or another, contribute to the education of his intelligence, imagination, affective life and will.

When we speak of the State, we are referring in general to public life, which today is influenced by other more or less private powers that manage advertising and the media, but which also depend on the regulation imposed on them by the State. These powers are today in the hands of a few who, having large financial means at their disposal, manage the press, radio-television and opinion organs, and who also, to a certain extent, exercise great influence over the State itself. Therefore, when we speak of the State, we refer to that series of factors that contribute to create the cultural life and the way of civilization of a determined people and, in general, of a region of peoples and today, by the communication of the peoples among themselves and above all by the influence of the nucleus of more developed nations, to that as universal civilization and culture that is shaping in a homogeneous way all the regions of the earth.

Well then, the State in itself and as the principal factor of public life with the other elements that contribute to forge it, cannot but influence by favoring or impeding, in a more or less remote or close way, the development of religious life. For this public life, being the expression and manifestation of man, bears in itself the imprint of man, and with it influences the whole life of a people. That manifestation cannot but reflect the attitude of man with respect to such a decisive and vital problem as survival in a hereafter, the existence of a personal Being, Creator of the Universe and just rewarder of man. So that this expression with respect to religion will have to be of sympathy, indifference or hostility, with the thousand nuances that fit within it.

b) *In the religious relationship of the State-civilization vis-à-vis the Church, there is room for infinite degrees ranging from total hostility, such as that advocated by communism, to total protection, such as that of the concord of the priesthood and the empire of past ages.* This point is clear in itself. The important fact has been pointed out in the preceding paragraph when the possibility of strict neutrality between State-civilization and Church has been excluded. However things are conceived, State and Church cannot be disregarded and ignored. For the Church has norms on human life on which the State also acts, and it will then be necessary that it be

and vital to human existence in many cases. Moreover, the Church presents itself to the world as a Universal Public Personality with a supernatural mission and message, demanding recognition and freedom for the exercise of its mission. Faced with this position of the Church, the State-civilization is absolutely hostile, rejecting the beneficial character of the religious fact and totally excluding it from life, which, for communism, all of it falls within the public sphere. In practice, this hostility towards religion can take many forms, as demonstrated by communism in China, Russia, Cuba, Yugoslavia, Poland and Hungary. The degree of this hostility will depend on the strength with which the Church and religion, in general, are implanted in the life of the people and also on the power that communism can achieve in its desire for domination.

There is also a diametrically opposite opposition to the previous one in the relations of State-civilization with the Church, and it is reached when the State, with its public life, puts itself at the service of the Church's ends. History has known the flourishing of these relations in certain privileged periods of the concord of the priesthood and the empire. Leo XIII left glorious pages in *Immortale Dei* in praise of that epoch in which the union of temporal and spiritual power contributed to the full formation of human life, reaching a high degree of value in philosophy, theology, art, politics and, in general, in the sanctity of all manifestations of human life.

But it is not for men to maintain for long the just balance of power. Neither of the men of the world nor of the men of the Church. That glorious concord fell into sterile and harmful struggles for the predominance of power. And it came to be thought that what must be considered normal on the level of essences must be impossible on the level of realization and existence. And that regime of subordination of the temporal power to the service of the spiritual declined first into one of subordination of the spiritual to the temporal and then into one of ever greater hostility between the two powers. A long history shows us strange forms of Josephism, royalism and anticlericalism.

In the meantime, there has been a transformation in the functions of the public power, which in a certain way has been abandoning the functions of

The Church today demands freedom and only freedom for the fulfillment of its mission. The fact is that the Church today demands freedom and only freedom for the fulfillment of her mission. Far from the past experiences, sometimes bitter, of the secular arm, the Church today prefers, and this is openly expressed in the Conciliar Declaration, a regime, if not of separation, then one in which the State disengages itself as much as possible from what concerns the religious sphere and leaves it in the hands of the Church of other religious communities or of private individuals.

c) *In the present situation of human history, the Church wants nothing more than a benevolent neutrality that recognizes her supernatural public personality and favors, even if not in a positive way, the freedom of her mission.* The entire conciliar Declaration, although it speaks of religious freedom as a right founded on the human person, refers to a well-determined historical situation, as expressed in its introductory paragraph and as we have commented above. This right has always existed and has always been recognized, although it did not acquire the *prominence* it has today because it was obscured and dominated by higher and superior rights. As the significance of the right to religious freedom has increased, even for errors and false cults, the role of the State in its protection of religious truth has been threatened. One and the other right walk, in a certain way, in inverse proportion. The historical fact registers the march in inverse proportion of an increasing freedom of false cults and a decreasing power of protection of the State over religious truth. The conciliar Declaration points out both facts and establishes a practical norm for the present historical situation, which limits the duties and rights of the State in this matter.

The prescription of the Church, with respect to the new duties and rights of the State in religious matters for the present situation, would require a lengthy explanation of the attribution that pertains to the Church by the disposition of Christ to legislate in this matter, in such a way that its sanctions oblige the civil power. But suffice it to state the fact. Every State which in any way pays homage to the supernatural character of the Church is henceforth obliged to conform its legislation to the new dictates of the conciliar Declaration. The pretended right of patronage of our Constitution is directly affected.

In order to justify *the lowering of* the State in the new historical situation, the Conciliar Declaration enunciates concepts that are strictly speaking incompatible with those enunciated in the ecclesiastical documents of the times when the service of the Public Power was claimed for the ends of the Church. It is said that the religious acts by which men address God in private and in public transcend the earthly and temporal order, which properly constitutes the sphere of temporal power. It would seem that the concepts and the language of the ecclesiastical Documents in which the obligation of religious profession of the Public Power was demanded were subjected to censure and that the argumentation of the liberals and secularists who denied this obligation of religious profession, invoking precisely the terrestrial and temporal character of the State, was given reason.

But such an interpretation would not be licit because it would render false the affirmation of the conciliar Declaration when in its first paragraph it says that religious freedom, in its new formulation, leaves "intact the entire traditional Catholic doctrine on the moral duty of men and societies towards the true religion and the one Church of Christ".

The only correct interpretation that is possible must be given within the terms of our commentary. The Conciliar Declaration recognizes the truth and validity of the traditional teaching which, by raising the State to spiritual and religious functions in the service of the supernatural, dignified it. The State and the civil power did not go beyond its mission or its sphere, but was employed in the highest task that can compete with it, serving, insofar as it was capable, the highest ends of all values. But, since this condition of the State in the service of the religious has become impossible, since the civil power has become incapable of the dignity of serving the supernatural, it is condemned in a certain way and reduced to an inferior function that does not go beyond the terrestrial and temporal plane.

The Conciliar Declaration implies a sanction against the secularism and agnosticism of the modern State. This State, having abandoned its high functions of maintaining in public life norms of religiosity and morality, has become more and more a purely material and mechanical entity, occupied in assuring the purely material needs of man. The modern State has been losing *its authority* to become a blind force of

pure *power*. The modern state has ceased to be human and has become brutalized. It has become a *machine*, into which society itself is becoming. The *lowering of* the modern State by the Conciliar Declaration is nothing but the juridical sanction that the Church, as the Sacrament of Supernatural Health with power over the Universe, pronounces on an already consummated fact. The Church seems to consider the modern State as irremediably lost for the fulfillment of its mission of being with its authority the representative of God. *Non est enim potestas nisi a Deo* (Rom., 13, 2). She prefers then that it be reduced in its authority so that it cannot use it for the perdition and ruin of man.

Herein lies the significance of the Conciliar Declaration at this most serious moment in human history. The danger threatening man today does not consist in his overreaching in the exercise of his freedom. On the contrary, the danger is that he will cease to exercise his freedom and become an automaton, automatically controlled by the great mechanisms that the State and modern society have become. In this respect, let us recall all the current literature, especially sociological, psychological and advertising literature, in which the automatism of today's man is expressed. The recent book by Vance Packard entitled *The Naked Society* is a clear example of the danger, all the more significant because it refers to the society of the United States, which is serving as an example and a goal for all countries. Let us especially bear in mind the increasingly powerful means being employed today for the conditioning and control of the mind and the human condition. In the face of this situation, which is not a hypothetical threat but a real and present danger which is added to the collectivist danger which has dominated large sections of humanity for the past fifty years, the Church calls the attention of men today to the need for *responsibility* and expresses the wish that "religious freedom may serve and be ordered so that men in the fulfillment of their obligations in social life may proceed with greater responsibility".

However, no matter how much the State and society are automated and mechanized, becoming totally neutral to the religious, a total alienation of the human and therefore a true religious neutrality cannot be achieved. Even in the United States, where the neutrality of the State would seem to reach a pure expression, there is no such neutrality. The Catholic Church is recognized, at least *de facto*, as a Universal Public Personality with a spiritual mission. Its structural and hierarchical character is respected. Its structural and hierarchical character is respected.

statements from Supreme Pontiff, head supreme head of the Church . It is this a recognition that goes beyond the level of mere neutrality.

Even in those state regimes in which neutrality was rightly to be considered hostile, it implied a reverential recognition of the Episcopate and ecclesial structures that went beyond mere neutrality. Thus, for example, in France, when the law of separation and persecution followed, the Church, in the midst of this hostility, had attained a high degree of Personality which was imposed on her persecutors. The same must be said today of communist countries such as Poland, Yugoslavia, Cuba and Hungary, where the supernatural force of the Church imposes itself on public expectation with salient characteristics that necessarily transcend the mere neutrality of the Public Power.

The Church today wants from the civil authorities a neutrality which, while recognizing her supernatural Public Personality, favors the freedom of her mission. This favoring implies in the first place that no obstacle be placed in the way of her internal constitution, which includes the management of Bishops, the formation of priests and religious, and regular and ordinary communication with the Roman Pontiff. This favoring can also involve a series of measures which, even if they do not involve positive assistance, contribute to facilitating the Church's mission, such as, for example, legislation that encourages public moral health in ideas and customs. The Conciliar Declaration speaks expressly that "the civil power.... should recognize the religious life of citizens and encourage it".

It is not possible to go into greater detail in the present question because the manner and the limits which the favoring of religion and of the Church should take on will depend on the particular conditions and circumstances of each people. In this whole question political Prudence must be exercised in a peculiar way, which must seek to achieve the greatest possible good as far as circumstances permit.

The conciliar Declaration expressly warns in paragraph 6 that "given the circumstances of the people, a special civil recognition can be attributed to a particular religious community in the juridical ordering of the city".

d) This benevolent neutrality of the State and of civilization towards the Church must move towards a situation that, far from hindering, favors the influence of the Church in the

Church.

Church on the life of the people. People today need the influence of the Church as the first good. For if people have needs, the first need they have need of is that of God, who communicates himself to us through Jesus Christ in his Holy Church. It is not the economy, nor culture, nor politics that is *primarily* deficient today. It is authentic religious life which, being in crisis, brings with it a crisis in all other manifestations of man. The Roman Catholic Church is the Institution placed by God to remedy in fullness this deficiency of man and peoples. Therefore, every civil power is obliged to carry out a policy which, without departing from the norms of Prudence and within the new directives of the conciliar Declaration, favors to the greatest degree this beneficial and irreplaceable influence for the well-being of peoples.

The Council Declaration has this meaning: to awaken people, *in the present historical situation*, to the desire for a healthy freedom that leads to the recognition of the "freedom of the glory of the children of God" (Rom. 8:21), which is given in the Truth.

Editor's Notes

Annotations of different pagination of the citations in the various editions have been added in the footnotes between square brackets, with the indication of the edition *L a M* ed. fr. - French edition, *De Lamennais à Maritain*, La Cité Catholique, Paris 1956- or 1st. ed. 1945. Here we have indicated the critical annotations on the text.

^A Ed. 1945¹ : "leftists".

^B In the original: "girones".

^C We believe it should read: "if not" or in any case "and not".

^D In the 1945 ed.¹ there is an editorial error here, omitting and erroneously replacing the first sentence of the paragraph (3rd. of page 34 in that ed.) with: "And on December 22, 1930 he published in L'Avenir"... a sentence that corresponds to the beginning of a paragraph nine pages later, in that ed., page 42.

^E "Current Pontiff" in ed. 1945¹ and fr. ed. 1956.

^F Ed. 1945¹ and ed. 1967² omit. "the", which is in ed. fr. 1956.

^G Ed. 1948¹ sends with an asterisk (*) to a footnote: "See at the end of the book note (2)", in which part of the text of Cardinal Pacca's letter is quoted. So also with a note (n. 83) the 1956 ed. fr. 1956: "Voir l'appendice No. 2". This is missing in the 1967 ed.², where the footnote erroneously given here on p. 51, note (83), citing *Du régime temporel*, p. 131, corresponds to the end of two paragraphs further on, as indicated in the ed. 1948¹, where it says: "Compare the reader this teaching with what Maritain - and here in ed. 1948¹ it was indicated in the text: "in his *Du Régime* (131)" - teaches about the 'collaboration of the philosopher and the man of action' to fix the *dynamic image of the new Christianity*". So also in the 1956 ed. fr. 1956, only that the quotation from the *Du Régime* indicates p. 133.

^H In his *Du régime*, p. 131, see N.d.E. of two paragraphs above.

^I Ed. 1945¹ : "masonic" instead of "secret of Freemasonry"; ed fr. 1956: maçonniques".

^J As in all citations, the 1945 ed.¹ grafts them into the text itself: "...says in *Les Droits...*", which we do not note every time here; *L. a M.* ed fr. cit. p. 32.

^K "anticipated" omitted. in ed. 1945¹ and in ed. fr. 1956 which brings only: "brouillons".

^L "en Religion et Culture" says here the text of ed. 1945¹ and ed. fr. 1956.

^M Error introduced in ed. 1967² : "the".

^N Ed. 1967² : "sea", error.

^O "*Christian civilization is not to be invented*"; repeated in error in ed. 1967² .

^P Here the comma following the successive parenthesis, in ed. 1945¹ .